From the Author.

80 d 22

AN

INVESTIGATION

OF

Mr. Malone's Claim to the Character

OF

SCHOLAR, or CRITIC,

Being an Examination of his

INQUIRY INTO THE AUTHENTICITY.

OF THE

Shakſpeare Manuſcripts, &c.

BY

SAMUEL IRELAND.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY R. FAULDER, NEW BOND STREET;
T. EGERTON, WHITEHALL; T. PAYNE, MEWS GATE;
AND WHITES, FLEET STREET.

AN

INVESTIGATION

OF

Mr. Malone's Claim to the Character

OF

SCHOLAR, or CRITIC,

Being an Examination of his

INQUIRY INTO THE AUTHENTICITY

OF THE

Shakspeare Manuscripts, &c.

BY

SAMUEL IRELAND.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY R. FAULDER, NEW BOND STREET;
T. EGERTON, WHITEHALL; T. PAYNE, MEWS GATE;
AND WHITES, FLEET STREET.

PREFACE.

I SHOULD not have been deſirous of reviving a controverſy, which has for ſome time ceaſed to occupy the public attention; or of entering into a diſcuſſion which the illiberal part of the world has caught at, for the purpoſe of indulging its natural propenſity to malevolence; and which a vain, weak, intereſted, and illiberal individual has uſed for the purpoſe of invading the peace of a private family, by introducing topics to which that diſcuſſion has no reference whatſoever. But I felt I had a right to expoſe the incompetency of Mr. Malone as a man of learning, upon

the only ſubject which he affects to know; and I more ſtrongly felt it a duty to expoſe his unworthy, and diſingenuous conduct, as a Man. This object has led me into inquiries which could not be purſued without conſiderable diligence and labor. Yet though I have entered into minute reſearches, for the purpoſe of controverting the poſitions of this Gentleman, I have ſcrupulouſly abſtained from the declaration of any opinion reſpecting the authenticity of the manuſcripts themſelves. I preſume not to diſturb the judgments of the public, if they have formed any, relative to the origin of the papers. The truth may probably be aſcertained at ſome future period, when literary animoſities ſhall have ſubſided, and the queſtion ſhall have been taken up by leſs intereſted and more temperate enquirers.

It may be expected of me upon this occaſion, to ſay ſomething upon a narrative and confeſſion recently laid before the public,

And

And near to me as by the ties of nature the author of that narrative is, it muſt be with ſincere regret that I feel myſelf compelled to announce that he withdrew himſelf from my houſe and family in the beginning of June, 1796, that during this period, no intercourſe beyond a ſhort communication at two different times, but neither of them under my roof, in the preſence of third parties has ſubſiſted between us. Whatever meaſures therefore, he has taken, relative to the elucidation of the ſubject, and of whatever interpretation his conduct may be ſuſceptible, cannot in the leaſt affect me; ſince he has been neither open to the remonſtrances, nor influenced by the admonitions, which the moral and natural authority of a parent might have ſuggeſted on my part. And as to his confeſſion, whether it receives credit, or whether it be altogether diſbelieved, it does not affect the argument which I have offered in this tract. I have merely conſidered the reaſon-

ings of Mr. Malone on the reſpective topics, which have ariſen out of the controverſy. I have attempted to prove that he is a bad reaſoner, and a futile critic, and that the general inference, which he has drawn as to the authenticity of the manuſcripts (whether true in fact or otherwiſe) is by no means eſtabliſhed by that mode of proof which he has adduced, and the arguments he has uſed.

AN

AN INVESTIGATION, &c.

THE greateſt difficulty which I have to encounter, in my examination of Mr. Malone's work, is that which ariſes from the ſuperfluous matter, with which it abounds. The advantage which that author derives, from this redundant and deſultory method of purſuing his ſubject, is very obvious. If he does not overpower his adverſaries, he at leaſt overwhelms his readers. They, who take up the book, not indeed from its bulk, but from the amplitude of its materials, are diſpoſed to feel a prepoſſeſſion in its favour; for where much labor has been obviouſly beſtowed, ſome learning is neceſſarily inferred. Thus the greater part of its readers are ſtupified into aſſent, and are perplexed into acquieſcence; becauſe they are willing to give the author credit for having proved that, which their own indolence will not ſuffer them to examine.

Before however, the opinions of any critic are examined, it is proper to ſee, whether he has any right to maintain an opinion at all. On what grounds does the critical competence of Mr. Malone reſt? In the beginning of his work he declares that he refuſed to inſpect the papers; that he rejected every invitation for that purpoſe. He has himſelf pleaded his own diſqualification.

All human opinion is the reſult of antecedent enquiry; and any opinion on any ſpecific queſtion, may be pronounced ſolid, or ill founded, according to the means and opportunities, which he who maintains it has had of enquiring into the evidence relative to it. Different queſtions require different evidence, and are tried by different ſenſes; but on queſtions concerning certain viſible and material inſtruments, inſpection is the only ſtandard to which reference is to be made. The eye alone examines into the evidence, becauſe it is only by the eye, that minute analogies can be remarked, and compariſons of colors, ſhades, and reſemblances fairly and accurately made. Mr. Malone ſays that he diſdained to try this queſtion by perſonal inſpection. He rejected the only fair, and ſatisfactory method of arriving at a judgment upon the papers. Mr. Malone has therefore proved himſelf very incompetent to pronounce concerning their merits.

It

It is worth while to remark the words of Mr. Malone on this curious topic. " I very early re-
" ſolved" he ſays " not to inſpect them at the
" houſe of the poſſeſſor, and I was glad to find
" that my friends Dr. Farmer, and Mr. Stevens
" had made the ſame determination; from an ap-
" prehenſion that the names of perſons, who
" might be ſuppoſed more than ordinarily con-
" verſant with the ſubject of theſe MSS might
" give a countenance to them, to which from the
" ſecrecy that was obſerved relative to their diſ-
" covery, they were not intitled." " I was un-
" willing that my name ſhould directly or indi-
" rectly give the ſmalleſt ſanction to theſe papers."

Upon this arrogant remark of Mr. Malone, I have only to obſerve, that had I imagined that Mr. Malone's inſpection of them would have given any ſanction to the papers, I ſhould certainly have deemed it advantageous to my own intereſt to have invited him. But Mr. Malone, and I are of a different ſentiment with regard to the ſanction, which his inſpection would afford them. Of Dr. Farmer I had a different opinion, and I was deſirous he ſhould examine them. Dr. Parr wrote him a long letter in my houſe, preſſing him to come to London for this purpoſe, and urging him to view the papers as a duty he owed to himſelf and the world. I mention this to ſhew,

that I did not ſhrink from the ſcrutiny of thoſe who, converſant with theſe ſubjects could have inſpected them with an eye of intelligence.

But, in point of fact, did Mr. Malone refuſe as he inſinuates, to inſpect theſe pretended originals? I am at iſſue with him on the fact. Mr. Malone was not invited to inſpect the MSS, but notwithſtanding his aſſertion to the contrary, he betrayed a more than ordinary ſolicitude to ſee them, both by letter, and by the moſt preſſing application to various perſons: theſe ſolicitations were fruitleſs, he was informed that he could not be permitted to ſee the papers, nor would they be ſuffered to paſs out of my poſſeſſion into any hands; unleſs I ſhould receive the commands of any part of the royal family, who might expreſs a wiſh to ſee them.

Notwithſtanding this information through another channel (that, to which he alluded in his note, p. 22), he earneſtly intreated a friend to procure Lord Southampton's letter, and ſome of the other papers to be brought up to his houſe at a ſtated time, in order that he might compare them with other documents in his poſſeſſion: requeſting that his name might not even be mentioned, as having made the requeſt.

The inſtrument through which this intrigue was to be carried on, was my ſon; and I will leave the

conduct

conduct of Mr. Malone, in reſorting to ſuch an artifice, with no other comment, than that which muſt naturally ariſe from the mere ſtatement of the circumſtance.

From what I have ſaid upon this topic, it muſt neceſſarily be inferred, that Mr. Malone is not always accurate in the ſtatement of his facts. There is a ſimilar inaccuracy in the very beginning of his work. He there ſtates that his friend Lord Charlemont ſubſcribed to the work, at the requeſt of a gentleman who furniſhed him with a ſplendid proſpectus of it; and "that if Lord "Charlemont had known as much of it as he now "does, he would not have given his name or his "money to the publication." In reply to this, I can poſſitively aſſert, that I never made any perſonal application for ſubſcriptions to his Lordſhip, or any other perſon whatever. The fact is, that Mr. Rowley, (I believe a member of the Iriſh Parliament), called upon me to inſpect the papers, and requeſted me to put down his name as a ſubſcriber, and the name of Lord Charlemont; at the ſame time this gentleman remarked that his noble friend was not a believer in the authenticity of the papers. I have ſtated this trivial circumſtance to ſhew that the inſinuation of Mr. Malone is not founded on truth; that his Lordſhip was not impoſed upon by any repreſentations, either in the pro-

ſpectus

ſpectus or by any other channel; but that he voluntarily ſubſcribed, with a declaration that he was not a believer.

Before I proceed to follow Mr. Malone, according to the diſtribution he has made of the ſubject, I would wiſh the reader to obſerve the temper, with which it ſhould ſeem he ſat down to the enquiry. In the firſt pages of his work, there is as profuſe a portion of egotiſm and vanity to be obſerved, as I ever remarked in any literary controverſy. His own capacity, as an illuſtrator of Shakſpeare, his own poſſeſſion of the documents relative to the bard, ſeem to be the only ſtandard, by which he tries the merits of the controverted papers. He ſeems to have entered into the diſpute, as if every thing that belonged to Shakſpeare was his own excluſive property; and that any thing relative either to the life, or the writings of that immortal poet which proceeded from any other ſource, was an infringement of his own appropriate and inconteſtable privileges. He ſays with a modeſty peculiar to himſelf, "I truſt "I ſhall not be charged with any idle vanity, a "weakneſs, if I at all know myſelf, moſt foreign "from my nature and diſpoſition." After this profeſſion of diffidence, it is amuſing to follow the critic into the minute detail with which he favours his readers, of all that he has done as a commentator

tator of Shakſpeare; a detail, in compariſon of which Mr. Vicary's panegyric on his incomparable têtes, or Mr. Packwood's eulogium on his own razors, is the very refinement of modeſty and delicacy. He is perpetually ringing in the ears of the reader, the antient documents of which he is in poſſeſſion. But till theſe documents are laid before the world, and an opportunity of examining their force, and authenticity be preſented to the public, it is ſurely a little too unreaſonable to expect that they ſhould be allowed to be the only teſt, by which all enquiries of this nature are to be examined. When the twenty ponderous volumes, with which the public is threatened make their appearance, we ſhall then be able to judge concerning the ineſtimable treaſures of the critic. In the mean while, the ſtate of mind in which the author of the enquiry has entered into the inveſtigation, muſt appear not to be very diſintereſted, when he virtually confeſſes that he has entered into it, on no other principle, and with no other feeling but that of an offended pride, and an unreaſonable vanity, which has taught him to imagine that the very name of Shakſpeare is not to be pronounced without his licence or indulgence.

I ſhall now follow Mr. Malone, according to the method in which he propoſed to examine the ſubject. The firſt article which he has ſelected for

for animadverſion, is what he is pleaſed to call the pretended letter from Queen Elizabeth to Shakſpeare.

" Wee didde receive youre prettye verſes
" goode Maſterre William through the hands of
" oure Lorde Chambelayne ande wee doe com-
" plemente thee onne theyr greate excellence.
" Wee ſhalle departe fromme Londonne toe Hamp-
" towne forre the holidayes where wee ſhalle ex-
" pecte thee withe thye beſte actorrs thatte thou
" mayſte playe before oureſelfe toe amuſe uſſe bee
" notte ſlowe butte comme toe uſſe bye Tueſdaye
" nexte, aſſe the Lord Leiceſterre wille bee withe
" usse."

Elizabeth R.

" For Maſter William Shakſpeare, atte the
" Globe bye Thames."

" Thys letterre I dydde receyve fromme mye
" moſte gracyouſe Ladye Elyzabethe, ande I doe
" requeſte itte maye bee kepte withe alle care
" poſſyble."

W. Shakſpeare.

This letter Mr. Malone profeſſes to try according to three different teſtimonies; the orthography

thography, the phraſeology, the date, and the diſſimilitude of the hand writing. But previous to his entering on the ſubject, according to this plan of diſquiſition, he indulges himſelf with a few preliminary remarks; which though they are rather curious in themſelves, than illuſtrative of the ſubject, it may be ſomewhat amuſing to examine. With much ſolemnity we are referred to what the critic ſtyles the archetype of this pretended letter, and the model on which it was conſtructed. It cannot be denied, that Mr. Malone would have made a very important diſcovery, had he ſtumbled upon any antient form of a letter, of which this letter from Elizabeth, was the indiſputable imitation or counterpart. But the reſemblance muſt be complete; if it is not complete, no inference can be drawn from it. No looſe analogies, no general ſimilitude, nothing ſhort of a perfect identity will juſtify any inference of this nature. Yet what is the ground, on which Mr. Malone ſuppoſes that this letter had an archetype or model, from which it was derived? Why, it ſeems that in the year 1710, Bernard Lintot publiſhed an edition of Shakſpeare's plays, and that in the preface to that publication, it was for the firſt time mentioned that " King James I. honored Shakſpeare " with an amicable letter written with his own " hand, and that this letter remained long in the

"hands of Mr. D'Avenant, as a credible perſon "then living could well teſtify." Sir William D'Avenant having died inteſtate and inſolvent, and his goods having been ſeized by his creditors, this letter was unfortunately loſt, and I fear will never be recovered. Here we have the germ and firſt principle of the letter from Elizabeth to Shakſpeare, now before us.

So then, becauſe King James wrote a letter to Shakſpeare, it is to be inferred that Elizabeth could not write one alſo. If Mr. Malone believes that King James could condeſcend to write to Shakſpeare, ſurely a *fortiori* it may be preſumed, that Elizabeth, whom the hiſtorians deſcribe as having more condeſcenſion of manners than her ſucceſſor, might write to her favorite poet, in the familiar terms of the preceding letter. Then our critic is pleaſed to obſerve, that the fabricator of theſe papers could have had no archetype (except her ſign manual), for the hand writing of Queen Elizabeth; and therefore that the imitation is clumſily executed. With regard to this objection, I can poſitively aſſert that there are in many private, and public collections, a variety of papers, moſt unqueſtionably the hand writing of Elizabeth; that I have in my own poſſeſſion many ſpecimens of this kind; and that he muſt have been a very ſtupid fabricator, who could not find autographs

of

of the Queen's ſign manual, and execute the tranſcript with ſufficient exactneſs for his purpoſe. But I would wiſh the reader to compare the autograph, which appeared in my publication, and to which Mr. Malone applies the terms "irregularity, "and licentiouſneſs," with that which he himſelf has exhibited. Surely the difference is ſo minute that it would be the height of abſurdity, to build an objection upon it. For when this fac-ſimile is compared with that of Mr. Malone's, there is no other difference to be found, but what might be diſcovered in the hand writing of any perſon whatever, when the difference of time and circumſtances is taken into conſideration. At one time, the Queen may be fairly ſuppoſed to have written with the greateſt care and exactneſs; at another, *currente calamo*; and yet the ſpecimens may bear a general reſemblance to each other. Mr. Malone ſays, that he "has peruſed from the time of Henry "IV. I will not ſay ſeveral hundreds, but ſeveral "thouſand deeds, and other MSS." But I much doubt, whether if he had ſeen them, he could have underſtood them; as I have been credibly informed that he cannot eaſily or readily, decypher the common hand writing even of the time of Henry VIII.

We now come to the orthography. Our critic obſerves that the ſpelling of this letter, as well as of the other papers, is not only, not the orthogra-

phy of Elizabeth, or of her time, but is for the moſt part the orthography of no age whatſoever. He then animadverts on the redundancy of vowels and conſonants in the Shakſpeare papers; and has exhibited ſpecimens of orthography from the time of Chaucer to near the end of the ſixteenth century. In p. 74, we are favored with a liſt of words in the MSS that it is ſaid are not to be found ſo ſpelt any where elſe. Now it unfortunately happens that in the vocabulary that follows, examples of moſt of them are adduced. And though Elizabeth did not ſpell the word *and* or *for* with the e final *ande*, *forre*, yet in a letter of hers to Mary, for which ſee Curioſities of Literature, vol. 2, p. 306, there are the following inſtances of her uſing the e final, and of other ſpelling which ſeems to correſpond with the fac ſimile of her letter, riche, greate, beinge, dothe, aſkinge, thinge, deſiringe, ſelfe, wiche, mynde, towarde, outwarde, hathe, bothe, ende, longe, &c. &c. I ſhall take the liberty in my turn, not to quote from the time of Chaucer, but to exhibit ſpecimens of ſpelling during the period, on which we are immediately occupied, in which it will be obſerved that this redundancy of ſpelling, was very common in thoſe times. In proof of this from many hundred inſtances the following are ſelected as ſufficient teſtimonies.

The

The words marked thus * are introduced in Malone's table of inſtances to prove the ſpuriouſneſs of the Queen's letter, under an inſinuation that they are no where elſe to be found. Obſerve, the inſtances here quoted are from printed books; and no doubt but in MSS of that day, many more inſtances might be adduced.

Adieu. From Nicol's Elizabeth's Progreſs. p. 2, and in Churchyard's Pleaſant Comedy. My deare, *adieu*.

* Atte. See Maſon's Eſſay on Deſign in Gardening, p. 172, and 182. See alſo Sir Richard Guyldford's Pylgrymage towards Jheruſalem, folio 43, printed 1511.

Att. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 148.

Awenſuers, (for anſwers). Lodge's Illuſtrations, vol. 2, p. 182.

* Ande. See Percy's Ballads, 4 Ed. 1794, p. 136, and 137, and Notes in p. 94, and 95.

Ande. See Gentleman's Magazine for May 1796.

Ande. See Lodge's Illuſtrations, vol. 1. p. 22.

Archebiſhop. ditto, vol. 1, p. 301.

Broſſe of doggs, (for brace of dogs). ditto, vol. 2. E 204.

Bee, (for be). Elizabeth's Progreſs, vol. 2, p. 60.

Bee. ditto, Pennant's London, p. 151.

* Before. Alviarie, 1580.

Buſhopp.

Buſhopp. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 48

Bawbles. See Life and Reign of Richard II. printed in 1681, p. 228, line 17.

Baubles. See Cymbeline, and in a Note by Stevens to the 91ſt Sonnet in *Malone's own Edition.*

Clappe. Elizabeth's Tranſlation of Seneca. See Nugæ Antiquæ.

Contempne. ditto.

Contynewaunce. ditto.

Clowdes. ditto.

Comhawendemente. From an ancient MS relative to the Howard family, in the 15th, century.

Cuntree, (for country). See Lodge, vol. 2, p. 43. From Elizabeth's own hand writing.

Clenged, (for cleaned). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 101.

Canne. ditto, p. 249.

Cuppe. ditto, p. 252.

Cownſaille. ditto, p. 188.

Coockoes. See Elizabeth's Progreſs, vol. 2.

* Doe. Elizabeth's Progreſs, vol. 2, p. 62, and in State Papers, p. 316.

* Doe. Water Poet, Pennant's London, and Stafford's Niobe.

Doonn, (for done). ditto, p. 316.

Doone, (for ditto). ditto, p. 155.

Daindgerooſly. ditto, vol. 3, p. 22.

Dyſkreete. ditto, vol. 2, p. 67.

Dowbtte. ditto, vol. 3, p. 26.

Dyſſave,

Dyſſave, (for deceive). ditto, vol. 2, p. 256.

Depelyer, (for deeper). ditto, vol. 2. p. 185.

Dramme. George Gaſcoine's Works.

Doompes, (for dumps). ditto.

Determynacions. Burleigh's State Papers, p. 321.

Exequuted. See Lodge, vol. 2, p. 39.

Exampell. ditto, p. 183.

Erre. ditto, p. 221.

Empploye. vol. 2, Lodge, p. 162.

Ferre, (for far). ditto, p. 5.

* Forre. See the Fflores of Ovide, printed in 1513, and Waldron's Literary Muſeum, printed in 1792.

Forbydde. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 250.

Fowerttien, (for 14). ditto, p. 144.

Faythebrekynge. vol. 3, p. 59.

Farre. See Conveyance from Walker to Shakſpeare.

Farre. See Nicol's Progreſs, in Verſes on the Coronation of Ann Boleyn.

Fryndeſhippe. Warton's Hiſtory of Engliſh Poetry, vol. 3, p. 423.

* Goode. Lodge, vol. 1, p. 306.

Gonne. ditto, p. 47.

Graciooſs, (for gracious). ditto, p. 75.

Grace. Frequently applied to Queen Elizabeth, in Nicol's Progreſs.

Gemme.

Gemme. Nicol's Churchyard's Pleaſant Conceits, p. 5.

Hellpe. Lodge, 1570, N. p. 25.

Huſe, (for uſe). See a MS letter from the Mayor of Doncaſter, in the Shrewſbury Papers, in the Heralds College.

Howſe. Lodge, p. 38.

Horſkeippar. ditto, p. 53.

Hadd anny. ditto, 120.

Horſſe. Letter from the Lords of the Council to E. of Shrewſberry, 1596. Lodge, vol. 3, p. 34.

Hee. Brown's Paſtorals, p. 2.

I ame, (for I am). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 32.

I mooſt, (for I muſt). ditto, p. 123.

Juſtyceſhyppe. ditto, vol. 3, p. 27.

Jerkins of Velvet. Elizabeth's Progreſs, p. 53, among Remarkable Events in 1559.

Knaifferie, (for knavery). Lodge, ditto, p. 79.

Lordſhyppe. ditto, p. 33.

Lieffetenant. Nicol's Churchyard, p. 35.

Myſcontentydde. Lodge, folio 47. 1559.

Mee. ditto, p. 19.

Manne. ditto, p. 249.

Mee. Taylor, Water Poet, 245

Meſter for Maſter. Burghley's State Papers, 445.

Monneth.

Monneth, (for month). Lodge, vol. 1, p. 316, 343.

Nues, (for news). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 64.

Nuers evyn, (for new years evening). ditto, 115.

Nyte, (for night). ditto, 200.

Nienttien, (for nineteen). ditto, 144.

Noe. ditto, 161.

Ourſelfe. Henry VIII. Preface to his Seven Sacraments, printed by Bartelet, 1543, p. 2 and 98.

* Oure. La Vieux, Nat. Brev. p. 219, 1580.

One, (for on). Malone's Prolegomena, p. 484, vol. 2.

Onne, (for one). State Papers, p. 166.

* Off. Lodge, vol. 1. 128.

Patronne. ditto, p. 48.

Purſſe. ditto, 204.

Putte. ditto, ditto, 250.

Purpoſſe. ditto, 54.

Pryceſſe, (for prices). ditto, 151.

Rangk, (for rank). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 47.

Redyneſſe. Elizabeth's Tranſlation of Seneca. See Nugæ Antiquæ.

Sonne. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 3.

Synnes. ditto, 16.

Shoolde. ditto, 35.

Sowne. ditto, 48.

Seemes. ditto, 435.

Soomerz, (for Summers). See Gaſcoigne's Works. Princely Pleaſures of Kenilworth Caſtle.

Shee. Taylor, Water Poet, p. 258.

Starre. Elizabeth's MSS. Pennant.

Thenne. Lodge, vol. 1. p. 78.

Toowardes. ditto, p. 29.

Tenne. ditto, p. 144.

Uppe. ditto, p. 158.

Uſſe, (for uſe). See Darell's Account of Grievous Vexations of ſeven Perſons of Lancaſhire.

Vertüouooſe. Lodge, vol. 3, p. 28.

Veu, (for view). Spenſer.

Viewe. Queen Elizabeth's Progreſs, p. 2.

Wytneſſes. Lodge, p. 344.

Woorſſe, (for worſe). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 15.

Woolde. ditto, p. 19.

Warres. ditto, p. 100.

* Wee. Elizabeth's Progreſs, vol. 2, p. 62.

* Wee. Taylor, Water Poet, p. 195.

* Wee. State Papers, p. 360.

* Wee. Stafford's Niobe, printed in 1611.

* Where. See Barrett's Alvearie, 1580.

* Withe. Bacon's State Papers, p. 315.

Yett. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 35.

Yee. Brown's Paſtoral, B. 2, p. 8.

* Yourre. 1559, ſee Lodge, p. 47.

If

If Mr. Malone wants MS proofs of a bad and indefinite mode of ſpelling, ſpecimens enough may be found in his 2d vol. of Prologomena, p. 447, and in his extracts from a vol. of Henſlowe's Notes, and Theatrical Accounts from 1597, to 1603.

Mulomurco, for Mulamulluco.
Spanes, for Spaniſh.
Malltuſe, for Malta.
Poope, for Pope.
Tamberzanne, for Tamberlane.
Gelyon, for Julian.
Janeway, for January.
Burdocks, for Bourdeaux.
Konkerer, for conqueror.
Heaſter, and Aſheweros, for Eſther, and Ahaſuerus,
Camdew, for Candia,
Foſtoſſe, for Fauſtus.
Greſyan, for Grecian,
Umers, for humors.
Anteckes cootes, for anticks coats.
Pygge, for Pſyche.
Anſhente, for ancient.
Serpelowes, for ſurplice.
Dowlfen, for dauphin.
Fayeton, for Phaeton,

Mought, for mouth.
Apelles, for apples.
Bengemyn, for Benjamin.
Hoate, for hot.
One, for on.
Adycians, for additions.
Hinchlow, a proper name, for Henſlowe.
Fower, for four. p. 493, ditto
Twooe, for two.

From the catalogue I have given, I preſume that Mr. Malone's objection to the letter of Elizabeth on the grounds of its orthography, being irreconcileable to the orthography of the age, is completely invalidated. But our critic lays much emphaſis on the objectionable ſpelling of the word Maſterre, and remarks that the ſpelling of the word at that period was *Maiſter*. Yet notwithſtanding the deciſive tone of this aſſertion, he himſelf produces an inſtance in p. 377, of his appendix, of its being ſpelt Maſter.

In the Paſton Letters, 2d vol. p. 292, he likewiſe conſeſſes that it is ſpelt Maſtyr, and in the Burleigh State Papers it is Meſter; ſo that if it appears that the orthography of this word was fluctuating and variable, and depended on the habits of the different perſons who uſed it, no poſitive objection againſt any ſpecific mode of ſpelling

it,

it, is at all fair or well grounded. Mr. Malone likewiſe remarks on the ſpelling of chambelayne, and objects to the omiſſion of the letter r, obſerving at the ſame time, that if the queen had omitted any letter it would have been the *m*. I reply to this, that he ought to have known that the word was derived from the French *chambelan*, and therefore that the letter m could not have been omitted, as there was no r in the French orthography. Beſides might not the r have been omitted by accident? As to his exception alſo to the ſpelling of *Londonne*, which he ſays was never ſo ſpelt, I refer him to Elizabeth's Progreſs, p. 231, vol. 2, where the orthography ſtands as in the letter *Londonne:* But there is another objection, and that it ſeems is a fatal one, to the unfortunate ſpelling of *Hamptowne*. Is it to be ſuppoſed, ſays Mr. Malone, that this learned queen who knew eight languages, ſhould be ſuch a dolt as not to know the orthography of a word ſo familiar to her? But, I would aſk, whether a man pretending like Mr. Malone, to be ſo converſant in theſe matters, does not in ſome ſort anſwer to the deſcription of *dolt?* Who has not obſerved the infinite licence of orthography, which characteriſed our language at this period? Who has not remarked, I do not ſay, the numerous deformities, but the capricious diverſity of ſpelling in almoſt every

book

book of the time? For a ſtriking illuſtration of the licentiouſneſs of Engliſh orthography at that period, I refer to a letter (in the Courtiers Academy printed in 1557), written by the learned Sir John Cheeke, to his loving friend Maſter Thomas Hoby.

In the preface to Upton's Fairy Queen, is the following remark on this ſubject, as far as concerns the orthography of manuſcripts. "The truth is, "that the printers and correctors of the preſs, "thought themſelves much wiſer in this kind of "lore, than either the poet or his editors." See alſo Maſon's recent publication of Occleeve's Poems, from a MS bought by him at Leigh and Sotheby's, in which the editor remarks in his preface, p. 17 and 18. "That there is a degree "of uncertainty in all that can be ſaid about aſcer-"taining the ſtate of our language at former pe-"riods."

Rowe on this ſubject ſays, in his account of the life, &c. of Wm. Shakſpeare,—that "we are "to conſider him as a man that lived in a ſtate of "almoſt univerſal licence and ignorance, there was "no eſtabliſhed judge, but every one took the "liberty to write according to the dictates of his "own fancy, &c. &c.

For a peculiar and indefinite manner of ſpelling, I refer the reader to Queen Elizabeth's Progreſs by

by Nicols, where in almoſt every page my obſervations will be amply corroborated; he produces inſtances in which the ſame word has eight different modes of orthography. In his note, p. 71, the word court is ſpelt in the following different modes, corte, court, coorte, courte, courght. With regard to Hamptowne, it is very ſingular, notwithſtanding the poſitive manner in which Mr. Malone aſſerted that it was uniformly ſpelt Hampton, that he himſelf has given an inſtance of *Hamptown*, beſides, which I have myſelf ſeen, Wintown, Cranſtown, Hoptown, and Milſingtown; and it would be very extraordinary if the final e, ſhould in this word be repugnant to the analogy of the language, when it forms the final letter of many hundreds of names of places after the ſyllable *ton*.

But we are now come to a miſnomer, compared with which all the others it ſeems are trivial, that is, the ſpelling of Leyceſterre, for Leyceſter. Then, to ſhew how fairly and legibly that nobleman always wrote his name, we are referred to the fac-ſimile of his autograph, given us by Mr. Malone; but ſurely he would not wiſh us to conclude, that all the autographs of the ſame individual will neceſſarily be equally fair and legible. Are the various autographs, for inſtance, in the Britiſh Muſeum, all of them equally fair and legible? and if one ſpecific autograph be leſs legible than

the

the other, who will infer that it is therefore a forgery? Yet Mr. Malone is completely ignorant of the mode of ſpelling the name at the period with which we are concerned. In page 72, he ſays, that the true orthography is Leyceſter; in the ſame page he repeats more poſitively ſtill, that "this nobleman himſelf always wrote it "Leyceſter;" again he ſays, in the ſame page, that "he uniformly wrote it Leyceſter." In direct refutation of theſe poſitive and dogmatical aſſertions, let me refer to the privy council book of that period, from which the following extracts are made, and by which it appears, that from January 19, to May 5, the name is not once ſpelt Leyceſter as Mr. Malone ſtates.

19 January, 1586, E. of *Leiceſter*, preſent in council.

21 January, ditto.

22 January, ditto, and ſo on always the ſame ſpelling.

1 April, 1587, E. of *Leyceſtre*, preſent.
Same day, E. of *Leiceſter*.
22 April, 1587, E. of *Leiceſtre*, preſent.
23 April, 1587, E. of *Leyceſtre*, preſent.
25 April, 1587, E. of *Leiceſter*, preſent.
Same day, E. of *Leiceſtre*, preſent.
26 April, 1587, E. of *Leiceſtre*, preſent.
Same day, E. of *Leiceſter*, preſent.

5 May,

5 May, 1587, E. of *Leyceſter*, preſent.
18 June, 1587, E. of *Leiceſter*, preſent.

Having brought forward ſo many MS proofs, I ſhall now refer the reader to Burleigh's State Papers, p. 527, where it is ſpelled *Leceſter*, in the ſame work, p. 543, it ſtands *Leiceſtre*, p. 545, it is *Leceſtre*; in the Annals of Elizabeth's Reign, publiſhed 1625, it is invariably printed Leiceſter. To ſhew that it was not uſual in thoſe times to ſpell theſe names with ſtrict uniformity, in Burleigh's Papers, p. 543, *Northfolck*, ſtands for Norfolk; in the ſame page *Norfolck*, and in the following page Norfolk, as it is uſed at this day. In p. 546, of the ſame book, Lord Shrewſbury's name is ſpelt *Scheruſbereis*; In p. 560, he is addreſſed by the queen as lieutenant in her own hand, Therle of *Shrewſbery*. It would be an endleſs, and a very unedifying labour, to point out theſe varieties. It is ſufficient to have cited theſe inſtances, to ſhew that Mr. Malone is utterly ignorant of the matters, on which he ſpeaks with ſo much preſumption and arrogance.

From the diſcuſſion of this curious topic which I have juſt cloſed, it will be remarked, how unſettled and capricious the orthography of our language was at the period alluded to. The ſpecimens I have quoted, will demonſtrate the abſurdity

of ſpeaking in a tone of deciſion on theſe ſubjects, or of drawing general inferences from ſpecific inſtances.

But we are now come to conſider Mr. Malone's exceptions to the *Language* and *Phraſeology* of the MSS. The firſt peculiarity, which he notices, is the word *pretty*, which he ſays was not the phraſe of the time. Here we have only an aſſertion, which like the others, that Mr. Malone's book overflows with, is of the ſame fallacious, and feeble nature. The word pretty was in general uſe, at this period, and is uſed by all the writers, who were cotemporary with Shakſpeare, as well as by Shakſpeare himſelf.

" For to a *pretty* ear ſhe tunes her tale."

Venus, and Adonis.

" He that hath ſeen the ſweet Arcadian boy,
" Wiping the purple from his forced wound;
" His *prettie* tears betokening his annoy,
" His ſighs, his cries, his falling on the ground."

Thomas Lodge's Scillas Metam. 1589.

" An yvorie ſhadow'd front, wherein was wrapped
" Thoſe *prettie* boures, where graces couched lie."

Ibid.

" No

" No more my glances play with him ſo *pretie*."
Ibid.

" Too traiterous *pretie* for a lover's *view*."
Ibid.

" Whoſe *pretie* tops with five ſweet roſes ends."
Ibid.

" That of their teares, there grew a *pretie* brook."
Ibid.

" Some *pretie* witneſſe to the ſtanders by."
Ibid.

" Delicious ſhine her *pretie* eyes."
Ibid.

" *Pretty* wit."
As you like it.

A *Prety* and Pleaſant Poeme of a whole Game of Cheſs, is the title of a book printed in 1597.

After theſe inſtances, eſpecially as he allows Shakſpeare, and Ralegh to have uſed *pretty tales*, can this critic doubt whether the epithet was applied to written compoſitions?

Theſe references muſt be more than are ſtrictly neceſſary to overthrow Mr. Malone's exception.

But he like ſome unſkilful horſeman, it ſhould ſeem, is prepared for a fall, and has provided againſt it. "I enter my proteſt" ſays he, "againſt the triumph of thoſe, who may produce "antient examples of the uſage of words to "which I object." This is curious. He attempts to prove the ſpuriouſneſs of the MSS, by ſhewing that the words uſed in them, were not the words or phraſe of the period to which the papers are attributed. Yet he enters his proteſt againſt every argument that upholds the oppoſite poſition. An ingenious mode of logic truly, and one that is calculated to ſave a world of argument on every ſubject to which it is applied. But let us hear his own juſtification of it. "If" ſays he, "out of four objections, only one ſhould be "found incontrovertible, it will eſtabliſh the ſpu-"rioufneſs of the piece as well as four hundred." Surely it cannot be expected that a ſerious anſwer can be given to ſuch a groſs, and palpable abſurdity; eſpecially where it has been ſhewn to be impoſſible, that any reliance can be placed upon any ſuch objections. A crown lawyer who on a caſe of high treaſon, after calling a liſt of witneſſes in ſupport of the charge, all of whom had been proved contradictory, and incompetent, would ſurely be extremely ridiculed if he were to exclaim; that if one witneſs could be produced whoſe evidence could

could not be diſproved, the contradictions, and perjuries of the others were to have no weight at all with the jury.

Then our critic proceeds to ſtart objections againſt the words *complement*, and *excellence*. With regard to the former, he objects to its uſe as a verb active, which he ſays "was never known in "this ſenſe, in that age, nor for ſome time after-"wards." In refutation of this, I would refer the reader to Florio's Italian Dictionaty, 1611, where it is plainly uſed as a verb active; *complementare to complement*, and *compire* to uſe *complements*, or *ceremonies*.

Mr. Malone obſerves on this topic, that till ſome inſtance be produced againſt him he has a right to aſſume that it did not exiſt. I have here adduced a deciſive evidence of its exiſtence. By the ſame right, and on the ſame principle the public are threatened with an edition of Shakſpeare in *twenty volumes*, where perhaps, after filling up whole pages with uſeleſs references as he has done here, it will end in an avowal of his ignorance, and the text will be left to ſome plain and unſophiſticated underſtanding to reſtore what has been defaced by the preſumptuous ignorance, and unfeeling drudgery of the commentator.

Now for the word *excellence*. Mr. Malone denies that it ſignified the purity or goodneſs of written

written compoſitions. But if the reader will turn to Barrett's Alvearie, 1580, and to Florio already quoted, he will ſee that the word is unqueſtionably, uſed in the ſenſe to which he objects; and ſurely if the epithet has this ſignification, it is the height of abſurdity to ſuppoſe that it might not be applied to written compoſitions, as well as to any other ſubſtantive to which adjectives are uſually applied: I will however produce another inſtance in the ſecond ſong in Brown's Paſtorals, where he ſpeaks decidedly of the *excellence of art*.

In the Overthrow of Stage Plays in 1600, p. 25, we are told that "Nero being tickled with "deſire of prayſe, and loving to heare men ap-"prove his playing on the ſtage with clapping of "their hands and crying out *excellent. excellent!*"

Two months after the publication of Mr. Malone's maſs of *hyper-criticiſm*, he corrects himſelf in the Gentleman's Magazine, as to the word *excellence*; and declares that "he had, had reaſon ſince "to believe that the word was thus uſed in Shak-"ſpeare's time." It is ſurely a ſingular circumſtance, that the critic after aſſerting in the moſt deciſive tone that the word was not uſed in the above ſenſe, ſhould without any apology or confeſſion of his own raſhneſs, retract his aſſertion. It puts us in mind of the gentleman mentioned in the Spectator,

Spectator, who knocked a man down in the ſtreet, and then very civily begged his pardon.

The next objection is to the word *oureſelfe*. He ſays that when uſed with the perſonal pronouns or prenominal adjectives, it was always written ſeparately. I ſhall cite inſtances as uſual to refute the objection. *Ourſelfe*. Henry VIII.'s preface to his own ſacraments printed by Bartelet, 1354, p. 2, and 93. Himſelf. Argument to the firſt edition of Shakſpeare's Rape of Lucrece, 1594. In R. Whiteford's Worke for Houſeholders, 1530, " hide, and give moſt diligence to order *youreſelfe* " and all youres, &c. that goth *before*." *Myſelfe*, Venus, and Adonis, 1600, See Supplement to Johnſon, and Stevens edition. *Thyſelf*, twice written in ditto, p. 441, ditto. *Themſelves*, ditto, p. 411. *Itſelf*, Sonnets, p. 95. In Chriſtopher Middleton's Hiſtorie of Heaven, 1596, we find " for prooſe whereof he ſees how greate beaſts " bow and humbly caſt *themſelves* at wiſe mens " feet."

" Then thinkes he unto *himſelfe*, &c." *Hymſelfe*. See Barclay's Batayle of Jugurth, 32 B.

But Mr. Malone wiſhes a diſtinction to be drawn between manuſcripts, and printed books, and obſerves that the united words of *ourſelfe* is not to be found in the manuſcripts of the age. In reply, I obſerve that from the various citations I have

I have made from printed books, it may very eaſily be inferred, that they were joined in the manuſcripts, from which the books were printed. For though in a few inſtances, whether from the careleſſneſs of the compoſitor, or any other cauſe, the printed copy might differ from the MS, yet it is hardly poſſible to ſuppoſe that this deviation would take place in the various books I have juſt inſtanced.

What follows in the catalogue of Mr. Malone's objections, is the exception he is pleaſed to take againſt the word *amuze*, which in its preſent ſenſe, he ſays is perfectly modern. In ſupport of this exception, he refers us as uſual, to his old friends, the dictionaries; among which he ſeems to have made many very elaborate reſearches. Then he *amuſes* us with a liſt of names, ſuch as Barret, Cotrave, Bullekar, and Sherrwood, in none of whoſe works he has been able to find the controverted word uſed in the ſenſe to which it is now applied. By ſome ſingular fatality in the critical labors of Mr. Malone, he ſeems always to look in the wrong place, for that, which perhaps when he looks after, he wiſhes not to find. For had he turned to Florio's Italian Dictionary, which I have before had occaſion to quote, he would have ſeen the word with the very ſenſe annexd to it, which he ſo poſitively ſays did not belong

long to it at that time. " To *amuſe*, *trattenere*, *tener a bada*.

Before I cloſe this topic, I cannot refrain from indulging myſelf in a ſingle remark, on the habit ſo peculiar to Mr. Malone; of citing dictionaries and lexicons in ſupport of his objections. He ſeems to have paid more devotion to Barret, Cotgrave, Cawdrey, Bullokar, Sherwood, Cockram, Philips, Cole, and Kerſy, than to the Nine Muſes: and he looks on their works as authorities, from which no appeal can poſſibly be had. But it requires little reflection to know that theſe authorities are at beſt defective; they cannot contain all the varieties and obliquities of language. Of ſome, the works were profeſſedly confined and partial; and others brought to the taſk, ſcanty and imperfect materials. The beſt dictionary does not contain all the words in ordinary and vernacular uſe; and ſo vaſt is the extent of human diction, and ſo inadequate is the induſtry of man to traverſe the whole field of language, that the moſt ſagacious of them all have complained, that their labour is frequently circumſcribed, and their purpoſes perpetually defeated. Mr. Herbert Croft ſays, that Dr. Johnſon, who is the beſt lexicographer the age has produced, has omitted thouſands of words, not merely of different ſignifications. I have made this obſervation to ſhew, that if Mr.

Malone is ſucceſsful when he refers to dictionaries in ſupport of his objections to the uſe of words, the authority on which he attempts to refute is ſometimes queſtionable, and always imperfect. But I have done more than this. I have ſhewn even from the dictionaries, to which he is ſo fond of appealing, that the words he excepts againſt, are uniformly uſed in the very ſenſe which he denies them.

We are now to conſider, what our critic calls the incongruous circumſtances attending the letter, the ſuperſcription, the negative date, &c. Firſt he objects to the ſuperſcription. "For Maſter "Wm. Shakſpeare atte the Globe by Thames." "So that" he ſays, in a ſtyle of banter, "the "meſſenger was to find out on which ſide of the "Thames, north, or ſouth, the theatre lay." Surely there is ſomething too frivolous in this objection to be noticed with ſeriouſneſs; for was it at all more neceſſary that the ſuperſcription of her majeſty's letter ſhould minutely point out the ſide of the Thames to which it was directed, than that a letter to David Garrick, ſhould have been ſuperſcribed to Drury Lane Theatre on the eaſt ſide of Brydges Street. With regard to the negative date of this letter, though I can poſitively aſſert that there never was a date upon it, as has been maliciouſly inſinuated, it is only from conjecture that I aſcribe

to

to it, that of 1588. It has alſo been inſinuated that Lord Leiceſter was dead, when this letter was written. It will be obſerved however, that this is mere conjecture. I have alſo my conjectures on the ſubject. The public will judge which is the moſt probable. In 1587, Lord Leiceſter went out a ſecond time to the Low Countries, for the purpoſe of raiſing the ſiege which was then carrying on againſt Sluys. He returned it is well known, in diſgrace with the privy council, on account of the miſcarriage of his enterprize. But a ſhort time after he was reſtored to the favour of her majeſty. In July 1588, when the Armada arrived in the channel, Leiceſter was appointed general at Tilbury fort, commanding 1000 horſe, and 22000 foot. After various engagements from 12th July, to 31ſt of the ſame month, the Armada was diſperſed and purſued by the Engliſh. Soon after this defeat, the queen went to St Paul's in public proceſſion; and general thankſgivings were offered up in commemoration of that glorious event; and there is every reaſon to conclude, that ſhe was not inattentive at that period to her favorite amuſement, theatrical exhibitions.

If any authority is allowed to the memoirs of Robert Cary, E. of Monmouth, in Nicol's Elizabeth's Progreſs, it ſeems " that plays, maſques, and " tournaments were ſmall branches of thoſe many

" ſpreading allurements, which Elizabeth made " uſe of to draw to herſelf the affections, and ad- " miration of her ſubjects. She appeared at them " with dignity, eaſe, grace, and affability." Now from every authority it appears, that the Earl of Leiceſter, from that time July 31ſt, was in perfect health, and continued ſo to the period of his death, which, according to D'Arcey in his Hiſtory and Annals of Queen Elizabeth, happened on the 14th of December, 1588. Stowe's Cronicle however, publiſhed in the year 1590, ſays, " on the 4th " of September, 1588, deceaſed Robert Dudley, " Earl of Leyceſter, Lord Steward of her Majeſty's " Houſehold, &c. &c. at Cornbury in Oxford- " ſhire, from whence he was conveyed to his caſ- " tle at Kenilworth, and from thence to Warwick, " where he was honorably interred." Admitting therefore that he died on the 4th of September, there was a ſufficient interval of time, for his uſual attendance on the Queen at theatrical repreſentations. Upon the hypotheſis of the date 1588, a reference to Aggas's map of London in 1568, to Vertue's map in 1560, and to that of Braun, and Haugenburgius in 1573, proves nothing to the purpoſe. Yet I might refer to a map publiſhed by Mr Pennant in his Hiſtory of London, which is a copy of one publiſhed in the year 1563. In this map, there is to be ſeen on the Bank-ſide, a

theatre,

theatre, which is ſet down as " Shakſpeare's play-
" houſe." Now though this is evidently an ana-
chroniſm, (Shakſpeare not being born till 1564),
yet it appears that a theatre ſtood which exactly
correſponds to the place, where the Globe Theatre
is ſuppoſed to have been built.

In order to corroborate his reaſonings our cri-
tic ſtates, that " he diſcovered a contract made
" the 8th of January 1599-1600, between Philip
" Henſlowe and Edward Alleyn the player, on the
" one part, and Peter Streete a carpenter on the
" other, for building the Fortune Play Houſe,
" near Golden Lane, which aſcertained the di-
" menſions and plan of the Globe Theatre, there
" called the late erected Play Houſe on the Bank-
" ſide, &c. &c. and I have lately diſcovered" he
continues, " a bond executed by Burbage the
" player to this very Peter Streete, on the 22d
" Dec. 1593." So then, the whole reaſoning
comprehended in this detail, is nothing more than
this! Peter Streete a carpenter, in 1599, entered
into a contract with Henſlowe, and Alleyn, to
build the Fortune Play Houſe. It is aſſerted, that
this very carpenter in the year 1593, had executed
with Burbage of the Globe Theatre, a bond for
performance of covenants. It is likewiſe aſſerted,
that the articles of agreement referred to in this
bond, *probably* related to the building of the

Globe

Globe Theatre, and might fix the building of it at 1593 or 94. Now it is very obvious, *that* is, a reaſoning *ex hypothesi*; which is equally the privilege of both parties on controverſies of this nature. Theſe articles of agreement might relate to any other concern in the life of Burbage, as well as to his connection with this theatre; or it might relate to the repairs of the theatre, or to any other tranſaction of the ſame nature. But all that I wiſh to ſhew is, that amidſt ſuch a variety of conjectures, the concluſion of Mr. Malone, that "the Globe Theatre did not exiſt at the "time to which this letter muſt be referred," is wholly unauthorized and unfounded.

We have alſo ſome curious objections to the uſe of the word *theatre*, on the grounds of its not being a word of the age. He ſays that it ſhould have been called the Globe Play Houſe, not the Globe Theatre. But I could produce innumerable illuſtrations, to falſify this aſſertion, not only from his cotemporary writers, but even from Shakſpeare himſelf. In this inſtance better authority indeed cannot be produced, than from Mr. Malone's Prologemena, vol. 2, p. 162, &c. where, in Stockwood's Sermon, publiſhed 1578, cited in a note, on the ſubject of the Curtain Theatre, it is ſaid "I know not how I might with the godly "learned, eſpecially more diſcommend the gor-

"geous

" geous playing-place erected in the fields, than " to term it, as they are pleaſed to call it a *The-* " *atre.*" Again Mr. Malone ſays in the ſame page of his Prologemena, that there were ſeven principal *Theatres*, and four that were called " public " *Theatres.*" We refer him likewiſe to his own notes *Paſſim* for the general uſe of the word.

" As in a *Theatre*, the eyes of men,
" After a well grac'd actor leaves the ſtage,
" Are idly bent on him, that enters next,
" Thinking his prattle to be tedious, &c.
Richard 2d. A. 5. S. 2.

" This wide and univerſal *Theatre*
" Preſents more woeful pageants, &c.
As you like it.

So Maſter Reynold's anſwere unto Maſter D. Reynolds, concerning *Theatre* ſights, ſtage playes, &c. printed 1600. Again in the ſame book, *Theatres*, ſights, and playes, p. 1, Lord Bacon alſo uſes it in the diſputed ſenſe. " So as they all " ſtood up as in a *Theatre*, viewing this ſight."

We are next told that the queen could not poſſibly have been at Hampton Court during the *holy-dayes*, which were generally the times of theatrical exhibitions. Thoſe holidays are ſtated by

by Mr. Malone, to be Chriſtmas, Twelfth-tide, Candlemas and Shrove-tide. But it might be aſked, were there no holidays in Bartholomew-tide? And is it unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the queen gave orders for the acting of plays during that feſtival, which was celebrated in the month of Auguſt?

Our critic proceeds to aſſert that the reſidence of the queen is aſcertained by the regiſters of the privy council. Now, ſays he, "From the "beginning of December, 1587, to the 8th July "1588, ſhe reſided at Greenwich. On that day "ſhe went to Richmond, where ſhe remained to the "end of July." Now what appears from the Privy Council Books? Allowing that ſhe was at Greenwich on the 26th of December, 1587, ſhe was at the Star Chamber, the 6th of February, 1588, on the 16th of April, ſhe was at Hackney; on the 14th of July, 1588, ſhe was at Richmond; and on July the 31ſt, at St. James. Theſe ſtatements which I have faithfully taken from the Privy Council books, wholly diſprove the aſſertions of Mr. Malone. But his grand argument is, that during theſe periods, her majeſty was not at Hampton. But ſurely, it cannot be denied, that the queen might have commanded plays to be acted at other times, as well as at the feſtivals, enumerated by Mr.

Mr. Malone, allowing for the ſake of argument, his ſtatements to be correctly made.

The next objection is, that the great poet, at the time to which this letter is referred, is ſuppoſed to be an eſtabliſhed actor, and the manager of a troop of actors. And then it is ſaid, "that his "firſt excurſion to the metropolis could not have "been before 1586, or 1587." Granting this ſtatement to be correct, it will be ſeen that he was now twenty-four years and a half old, being born in April 1564. Now what reaſon is there to conclude from any thing that appears in the hiſtory of his life, that at this age, his talents as an actor had not attracted the notice and received the patronage of his royal miſtreſs? Then it ſeems our commentator has written an hiſtory of the Engliſh ſtage, in the future edition of which it will be ſhewn, that it is highly improbable that Shakſpeare ſhould have produced a ſingle drama, till ſome time after the period of 1586. Granting this probability to be well founded, does it neceſſarily follow, that he had not the management of the theatre at the time alluded to, or that he had not written the pretty verſes to Elizabeth, to which her majeſty's letter refers?

But to ſhew that our bard had not written any of his ſublime productions at the above period, it is obſerved, that none of his works are alluded to

by Naſhe, or Puttenham; the former of whom was the author of an epiſtle to the univerſities, in which he reviews all the celebrated poets of the time, and the latter of the art of poetry; and that by neither of theſe writers, who publiſhed in the year 1589, is Shakſpeare at all referred to as a dramatic poet. In reply to this, I obſerve, that no omiſſion of this nature in the works of cotemporary writers at all proves that Shakſpeare was not an author of reputation at that time, becauſe there are many inſtances in which ſimilar omiſſions and equally remarkable may be obſerved; it is an extraordinary circumſtance, that Brown in his Britannia's Paſtorals, publiſhed 1613, in the very zenith of Shakſpeare's reputation as a dramatic poet, ſhould have given a panegyrical enumeration of all the principal poets who flouriſhed about that time, ſhould not have once mentioned the very name of our immortal dramatiſt. He begins with Sydney, p. 36, folio edition; then alludes to Chapman, with the eulogium of "*learned Shepherd*;" next Drayton, as a "*Second* "*Ovid*;" Ben Johnſon, he characteriſes thus,"

"Johnſon, *whom not Seneca, tranſcends his* "*worth of praiſe.*"

"He likewiſe mentions Daniel, Brooke, Davies, Withers, &c. &c.

Put

But in this catalogue of poetical perſonages, the name of Shakſpeare is not once alluded to. It is no leſs extraordinary, that Sir William Temple, the moſt accompliſhed writer of his age, in his enumeration of the epic poets of modern Europe, had entirely overlooked the immortal name of John Milton. In one word, no truth is more completely demonſtrated to thoſe who have made theſe reſearches, than the ſcantineſs and barrenneſs of materials relative to the biography of Shakſpeare's time, and nothing ſeems to me a more convincing proof of it, than this circumſtance; that after all the enquiries which have been directed to this ſubject, we know ſo little of Shakſpeare's theatrical life, that we are not even informed about the characters, in which he appeared on the ſtage.

In a ſtyle of banter, with which Mr. Malone is ſometimes diſpoſed to diverſify, though it does not embelliſh, the ſerious dullneſs of his work, that the note annexed by Shakſpeare to the letter in queſtion, "is more like the punctilious exactneſs "of a merchant, or attorney, than the well known "negligence of the modeſt and careleſs Shak-"ſpeare." But the critic ſhould have known, that this paper was in itſelf of a curious nature; that the moſt negligent perſon, who had received a let-

ter from his ſovereign, would naturally treaſure it up as a valuable token of royal condeſcenſion, and as the moſt flattering tribute, that could be paid to the genius of an author.

Of the ſame nature is the remark, that it is improbable that the "*pretty verſes*," ſhould have been loſt, while the proſe was ſo carefully preſerved. The obſervation is ſo very frivolous that it can ſcarcely affect the queſtion before us. But it is ſurely the very climax of folly, to form any conjectures concerning the loſs of papers, or their preſervation. Shakſpeare might probably ſet an higher value on the proſe of his royal miſtreſs, than on his own poetry; and the piece, which he addreſſed to her, though expreſſed in a complimentary ſtyle, might be of ſo ſlight a nature, that neither Shakſpeare himſelf, who was uniformly negligent of his poetical reputation, nor any of his cotemporaries, might think it neceſſary to tranſmit it to poſterity. It is idle, however to frame conjectures concerning the preſervation, or loſs of papers, circumſtances, which are governed by cauſes of ſuch various, and incidental operations.

In a note Mr. Malone has favoured the readers of his work, with a ſhort poem addreſſed to Queen Elizabeth by Shakſpeare, in the mock-heroic ſtyle. He has exhibited it in order to ſhew the world, that

that a critic can occaſionally write verſes, as well as notes. But I fear, that the tendency, the meaning, and the conſtruction of the lines, will perplex and baffle the ingenuity of all who may attempt to find either tendency, meaning, or conſtruction in them. This is ſurely very gratuitous folly in the commentator. No one called for the diſplay of poetical talent in a man, whoſe province is as remote from poetry, as the notes which he fabricates, are foreign from the inſpiration of the text he attempts to illuſtrate. Why ſhould he have leaped over the fence, which has hitherto ſecured the ſacred ground of poetry, from the unhallowed intruſions of thoſe, who labour in the humble, though uſeful departments aſſigned to compilers and commentators?

" But," ſays the critic " in the name which " has been exhibited as the hand-writing of the " queen, there are no leſs than ſix groſs errors." Now reader, what is the firſt error? Why, " that " it is too ſmall for the period, to which it muſt " be referred." Here then we ſee the wonderful art of the critic exhibited to perfection. At the diſtance of two centuries he can aſcertain the gage and dimenſions of a ſignature; and with a nice and accurate meaſurement, fix the preciſe period at which it was written, by the ſize and bulk of the letters. Mr. Malone is poſſeſſed of her

majeſty's

majeſty's autographs in the firſt, fifth, tenth, and fifteenth years of her reign; and it appears from theſe, that her hand-writing gradually enlarged as ſhe advanced in life, and that in the year; 1587, or 1588, it was at leaſt a fourth, perhaps a third larger than when ſhe came to the throne. God ſave the mark! and could not this ingenious critic by the ſame rule, aſcertain the ſize of that of her maids of honour, and ladies of her bed chamber, and fix its progreſſion, and dimenſions, as they advanced in life? But to ſpeak ſeriouſly. How is it poſſible to decide on the exact ſize of a hand-writing of any perſon, and by that fix the exact period of his life at which it was written?

The ſecond error, it that the autograph inclines ſideways, whereas the genuine autograph is *bolt upright*. Here the critic again reſorts to his wonderful rule for meaſuring her majeſty's autograghs. Now it happens unfortunately, that Mr. Malone's ſpecimens of the autographs are not *bolt upright*. and, if as he remarks, the flouriſh is always obſerved under the firſt letter, in order to make a complete E, how comes it, that in the Muſeum Veſpaſian, P, there is a letter from the queen with her ſignature, of which the flouriſh does not interſect the letter, and leaves it therefore as complete an F as in the fac-ſimile of the Shakſpeare MSS. I have in my poſſeſſion eight unqueſtionable autographs of this

this princeſs, to official papers, in which this flouriſh uniformly interſects the firſt letter. I mention this circumſtance merely to ſhew, that as it is ſo notorious that ſhe was accuſtomed to write her name in the method alluded to, that if the imputed forger had followed any model, (and how could he have forged her name unleſs he did), that the particularity muſt have neceſſarily ſtruck him.

Now we come to the fourth blunder, viz. in the *a* of the autograph. I can ſcarcely condeſcend to remark on an objection which is ſo minute and frivolous, that it almoſt implies a degradation of underſtanding to have diſcerned it. Let me quote the paſſage. " In the early part of her reign ſhe " formed the direct ſtroke of that letter like other " perſons: but by degrees it became higher than the " circular part; nor was it ever open or looped at " the top, &c. &c. This exquiſite minuteneſs of remark, is highly amuſing in our commentator; it reminds us of Malvolio, who was not in the leaſt more accurate in the diſcovery of his lady's hand-writing. " By my life this is my lady's hand: theſe be her " very c's, her u's, and thus makes ſhe her great " P's; it is in contempt of queſtion, her hand."

Of the ſame nature are the other objections which follow, relative to the b of her majeſty's hand. The argument has nothing in it that makes an appeal to the taſte, curioſity, or judgment of the reader

reader. I ſhall diſmiſs it with a very little comment. I would, however, aſk how any critic can aſcertain the preciſe form, in which an individual writes a name, or frames a word, and lay down a peremptory and determinate opinion upon ſuch a ſubject. He who writes his name at one time in one manner, will write it again in another; and I believe, that it is abſolutely impoſſible, that the ſame words, or letters ſhould be framed in exact reſemblance to each other, in the ordinary habits of writing. When we write our names, we do not make fac-ſimiles from any preceding model: beſides the whole weight of the objection, will overthrow the argument which Mr. Malone labors to eſtabliſh; for had the ſpecimens exhibited in the Shakſpeare MSS, correſponded with ſuch minuteneſs, to the uniform, and well known ſignatures of Queen Elizabeth, theſe would be *prima facie*, a preſumption of fraud. The queen never wrote her name at different times, in the ſame form and modification of the letters. It is impoſſible that ſhe could. But if the autographs aſcribed to her, ſhould be found exactly in ſize and form, to anſwer to any ſpecific ſpecimen of her ſign manual, it would neceſſarily give birth to a ſuſpicion of impoſture and fabrication. I remember the trial of a diſputed will, where in anſwer to a claim that was ſet up, it was obſerved

by

by the council, that the name in the will ſo exactly correſponded to the known method in which the deceaſed wrote his name, that no further objection could be had to it. In reply to this, it was very judiciouſly remarked on the other ſide, that the very circumſtance alledged to be in favor of the will, was totally deſtructive of it; inaſmuch as no perſon ever wrote his name twice exactly in the ſame way. In ſupport of this remark, a perſon in court was deſired to write his own name ſeveral times on a ſheet of paper, which he did, and on preſenting it to the bench, the deviation was ſo very obvious, that the will was entirely ſet aſide upon the very grounds, which appeared ſo inconteſtably in its favour.

But before I cloſe this part of the ſubject, I will juſt advert to the alphabet adduced by Mr. Malone in his firſt plate. Now in this very alphabet it is obſervable that the letters deviate materially from the two extracts made from the Cotton MSS, in the Muſeum. In the ſame extracts the letters differ from each other; particularly the letter (t), in which there are no fewer than five obvious deviations. The extracts alſo differ from the letter of the queen in the Herald's College, nor do they differ leſs from one written by her, before ſhe came to the throne, in the Muſeum. See Veſpaſian, f. 3. p. 20. I would here admoniſh

Mr. Malone, when he publiſhes any future fac-ſimiles, to be more correct in copying from the originals before him; becauſe the ſlighteſt inſpection will convince any one who compares them, that he has been intentionally incorrect in the fac-ſimile he has publiſhed.

Our critic, it muſt be obſerved in exhibiting theſe compariſons, takes it for granted that the ſpecimens he diſplays are genuine. But I have reaſon to entertain doubts concerning their authenticity. When I inſpected theſe papers in the Muſeum, in the preſence of a gentleman univerſally allowed to be a competent judge of theſe matters, we urged an objection before two other official gentleman who verſed as they may be ſuppoſed to be therein, were not at that time able to anſwer. The objection was, that the letter N beginning, "I thanke you good Harry," &c. &c. diſcovered a reverſe, or an impreſſion on the blank page oppoſite to it againſt which it was folded, of the whole body of the letter, as well as the queen's ſignature. This appearance, certainly a very extraordinary one to be produced by common ink, is not only obſervable in the body of the letter, which was prepared by a clerk, but alſo in the ſignature; ſo that if this is to be conſidered as a genuine inſtrument it is evident, her majeſty and the ſecretary or clerk muſt have uſed the ſame

ink;

ink; which is not very eaſy to ſuppoſe, even if the ink were ſuch, as was ever known to be in common uſe. Another objection to the opinions of Mr. Malone, as to the authenticity of theſe papers, is, the circumſtance of the letters being placed in a collection of a totally different nature, and called "The Book of Border Matters till the "year 1583." The laſt objection is, (and it is a material one), that there is written in one of the leaves, "*One of the bundles I bought of Mr. Phil-*"*lips.*" Who this Mr. Phillips was, probably we ſhall be informed by Mr. Malone, upon ſome future occaſion. Perhaps he was one of the friends, who correſponded on matters of antiquity with Sir Hans Sloane, and received from his credulous employer, commiſſions ſimiliar to thoſe alluded to in an ingenious epiſtle, addreſſed ſome years ago to that great antiquary.

An Epiſtolary Letter to Sir Hans Sloane.

Since you, dear doctor ſav'd my life
To bleſs by turns & plague my wife,
In conſcience I'm oblig'd to do,
Whatever is enjoin'd by you:
According to your own command,
That I ſhould ſearch the weſtern land,
For curious things of every kind,
And ſend you all that I could find.

I've ravag'd air, earth, ſea, and caverns,
Men, women, children, town, and taverns,
And greater rarities can ſhew,
Than Greſham's College ever knew;
Which carrier Dick ſhall bring you down,
Next time his waggon comes to town.
First then obſerve, and you ſhall ſee
A very, very rarity;
It is the true authentic ſcore,
On which King David us'd to pore,
And gain'd ſuch wond'rous approbation,
He was firſt fiddle of the nation.
I've got three drops of that ſame ſhower,
Which Jove in Danaës lap did pour,
From Carthage brought, the ſword I'll ſend,
Which brought Queen Dido to her end.
The ſtone whereby Goliah died,
Which cures the head-ach, well applied.
The ſnake-ſkin, which you may believe,
The devil caſt, who tempted eve.
A fig leaf apron, 'tis the ſame,
That Adam wore to hide his ſhame,
But now wants darning; I've beſide
The blow by which poor Abel died;
A whetſtone worn exceeding ſmall,
Time us'd to whet his ſcythe withal.
The pigeon ſtuff'd, which Noah ſent
To tell him when the waters went.
A feather from the honeſt raven,
That brought Elijah ſcraps from heav'n.
A bull-ruſh taken from the cradle,
In which young Moſes us'd to paddle.

St.

St. Dunſtan's tongs, which ſtory ſhews,
Did pinch the devil by the noſe.
With a knife-point full of that ſalt,
Lot's wife was turn'd to, for the fault,
Which ſince is grown ſo very common,
Who has it not, cannot be woman.
The very ſhaft, which all may ſee,
That Cupid ſhot at Anthony;
And which above the reſt I prize,
A glance of Cleopatra's eyes.
Fringe work compos'd of thoſe rich threads,
Broke at the loſs of maidenheads;
Rare, curious things, by Leiceſter ſeen,
And ſhewn him by a virgin-queen;
At leaſt to him or Howard ſhewn,
Things never heard of ———
Some ſtrains of eloquence, which hung
In Roman times, on Tully's tongue;
Which lay conceal'd, and loſt had been,
But Cowper found them out again;
A goad which nightly us'd will prove,
A certain remedy for love.
As Moore cures worms in ſtomachs bred,
I've pills cure maggots in the head,
With the receipt too, how to make 'em,
To you I'll leave the time to take 'em.
I've got a ray of Phœbus ſhine,
Found in the bottom of a mine.
A lawyer's conſcience, large and fair,
Fit for a judge himſelf to wear.
I've a choice noſtrum, fit to make
An oath a church-man will not take;

In a thumb-phial you ſhall ſee,
Cloſe cork'd ſome drops of honeſty;
Which after ſearching kingdoms round
At laſt were in a cottage found;
An antidote, if ſuch there be,
Againſt the charms of flattery.
I han't collected any care,
Of that, there's plenty ev'ry where;
But after wond'rous labor ſpent,
I've got one grain of rich content.
It is my wiſh, it is my glory,
To furniſh your nick-nackatory;
I only beg, whene'er you ſhew 'em,
You'll tell your friends, to whom you owe 'em;
Which may your other patients teach,
To do, as has done.——

Yours,

T. H. (edges.)

We now return to the critic, whoſe next topic relates to "EXTRACTS FROM MISCELLANEOUS "PAPERS, A NOTE OF HAND, AND A RECEIPT." Under this head we have a moſt curious diſquiſition concerning the ſpelling of the poet's name. "The fabricator of theſe papers is ſaid to have "been led into his miſtake by *Mr. Steevens, and* "*Myſelf.*" Then we have a long and as uſual a very tedious ſtory about this miſtake; *how* in the year 1776, *Mr. Steevens, and Myſelf* traced the three ſignatures in the will; *how* two of them appeared

Shakſpere,

Shakſpere, but a third appeared to have an *a* in the ſecond ſyllable. " *Accordingly we have ſo exhibited* " *the poet's name ever ſince.* I had no ſuſ- " picion," ſays the critic, " of my miſtake, till " about three years ago, &c." From this ſtatement, it ſeems that theſe ſtupendous critics repoſed on this error for near twenty years, till after having deluded the public during that period, and receiving the hint from another perſon, one of them reſolves to examine the original (which he might and ought to have done before) again, and this enquiry putting it once more into his brain, to aſcertain his error, *if any error there was*, relative to the name, before he publiſhed his new edition of Shakſpeare.

Then the commentator, on an inſpection of ſome papers, recently diſcovered by Mr. Albany Wallis, appears to have rectified his miſtake, and allows that the name ſhould be ſpelled Shakſpere. Yet notwithſtanding his having ſet himſelf right in his miſtake, with an inſtinctive predilection for his own blunder, he continues to write it *Shakſpeare*. Why he does ſo, will appear for reaſons aſſigned in " *My life of him.*" Still " harping upon my " daughter," the *Twenty volumes royal octavo*. Upon the whole it muſt appear that the manner of Shakſpeare's ſpelling his own name reſts only on grounds of probability. For when we conſider,

as

as I have more than once been obliged to remark, the extreme licence which at this period, and for ſome time after prevailed in the orthographies both of MSS, and of printed copies; it is ſcarcely poſſible to pronounce upon this ſubject. In proof of this, I refer the reader to his will in the Prerogative Office, in the body of which it will be ſeen that his name is thus ſpelt *Shackſpeare*. But ſurely it is the moſt provoking effrontery to aſſert, that the neceſſary conſequence of his having three or four years before his death, written his own name *Shakſpere*, is a certain proof of the forgeries of the papers; when we know that during his life, his cotemporaries always ſpelt his name Shakeſpeare, and that he himſelf from the year 1594, till his deceaſe, uſed the ſame orthography in each of the various editions of his Lucrece, and his Venus and Adonis. But continues our Critic, "whether "I am right or wrong, it is manifeſt that he "himſelf wrote it Shakſpere:" yet let us hear the concluſion: The concluſion is, that thoſe papers in which a different orthography appears, muſt be forgeries. I anſwer that the papers are not forgeries, becauſe the orthography in this reſpect is different. The reaſon why Mr. Malone himſelf, maintains his former ſpelling, is that there is no original

original Manuſcript letter, of his name. If therefore there is this incertitude concerning the name, who can put his finger on any ſpecific ſpelling of it and ſay that is not the genuine one? I may ſay, in the ſame words which Mr. Malone has uſed, in juſtification of his own ſpelling, that when any original letter or MS of Shakſpeare's ſhall ever be diſcovered, then and not till then, will the orthography in my MSS be diſproved.

In p. 121, Mr. Malone ſays, that his engraver deſired him to furniſh him with an archetype for one of the concluding letters, viz. (r): and that he inadvertently took down the firſt MS that came to hand, and pointed out to him a German (r). Here we ſee, that Mr. Malone himſelf can be occaſionally guilty of interpolation, though he has ſo thorough an abhorrence of Forgers; he takes down an old German MS, in order to furniſh a fac-ſimile of Shakſpeare's hand-writing!! Now with regard to the uſe of the Chancery r in the Shakſpeare MSS of which he complains; he ſays, "that now and then, a ſignature may be "found in which it occurs; but in the ordinary "or ſecretary hand I have never met with it." He has never met with it. This is admirable! And how is the reader to eſtimate this ſort of reaſoning? Every one who has examined the topics, on which I have been ſpeaking, muſt have had

abundant proof of the ſlender claims which this critic has to a blind confidence in his own opinions, and aſſertions.

For the long or chancery *r*, *as he has never met with it*, I refer him to Wright's Court-hand, Reſtored, (a book, the authority of which cannot be doubted) there he will find that this objectionable letter has been in conſtant uſe ſince Henry the fourth's time, as by reference to many records of more antient date, it will appear to have been for many centuries previous to that period.

It is very curious, that in p. 250, he tells us, that Lowine the player, never had his name exhibited with *ine*, as the final letters. But, the proof of this! Why, "*he never met with it.*" Of the critical accumulations of this gentleman in his intended life of Shakſpeare, I know nothing at preſent, but from what he has intimated to the public, concerning them, I hope that he will not follow his old and favorite mode of reaſoning, in concluding things not to be in exiſtence which he himſelf *has not met with.* On this head, I ſhall content myſelf with aſſerting, that I have met with (what he ought to have ſeen) the name of *Lowine* in the liſt of actors, prefixed to the firſt folio edition of the immortal breathings of that muſe, who is about to be mangled and lacerated, in twenty ponderous

derous volumes, ſo fully announced by the indefatigable compiler.

I might refer the reader to the different variations in the fac-ſimiles, which the critic himſelf has exhibited; were I not conſcious, that the labor of following Mr. Malone through the long labyrinth of abſurdity, in which he involves himſelf and his reader, muſt have been already intolerable and diſguſting. But what does the whole argument amount to? Why, it proves that taking for granted, that theſe papers are forgeries; Mr. Malone's blunders were in fact the ſources, from which they were derived. What muſt the world think of a man, ſhould it appear by ſome hidden evidence now in the womb of time, that the whole maſs of papers was an impoſture, when it is his own confeſſion, that the moſt prominent features of it were derived from his errors?

With the ſame miſcroſpic powers of criticiſm, our objector obſerves, that Shakſpeare "when in "health wrote a ſmall hand, as was the general "mode at that time, and that this is not the caſe "with the forged MSS." What proof does Mr. Malone adduce? Where is it manifeſt that he wrote this ſmall hand? For, that he did not write in that way, is unqueſtionably proved by his autographs to the will, and to thoſe which are now in

Mr. Wallis's poſſeſſion, the only genuine ſpecimens he admits that are to be found.

We are told, that in the *projected* HISTORY OF THE STAGE, the critic has aſcertained the payment of a play at court, and that the ſum paid for each repreſentation there, in the reign of Elizabeth, was no more than ten pounds. He ſays, that he has found this from authentic documents. To theſe authentic documents, however, he has forgotten to refer us. We muſt ſtill give him credit, for that which in all diſcuſſions of this nature, muſt be held an indiſpenſable duty, I mean, a reference to the documents, on which an aſſertion reſts. Then Mr. Malone points out the abſurdity of Lord Leiceſter's paying to the actors thirty-one pounds more than was charged to him. The weakneſs of this ſpecies of objections, which are multiplied through the whole work of our commentator, is very apparent. Was it an unuſual thing, at that period, that a nobleman who lived in the magnificence and ſplendor of Lord Leiceſter, ſhould pay for a favorite amuſement, and to his favorite actor, no more, than the mere literal expences, that were incurred?

But as another denotation of forgery, it is remarked, that the poet is repreſented in the MSS to be ſo ignorant, as not to know an earl's proper title: and then we are informed, that "your

"grace"

"grace" is the uſual mode of addreſs to dukes; but that the circumſtance of its being applied to Leiceſter, is a proof of the papers being forged. But it is worth while to obſerve, that Mr. Malone himſelf readily acknowledges, that the title was not confined to dukes, but that it was applied indiſcriminately to the king, and the princes of the blood. Now it ſhould ſeem from this very circumſtance, that the mode of addreſs was not confined to dukes; and we well know, that it is neither the appropriate title of king, or queen, nor of the princes and princeſſes of the blood; your majeſty being the ſtyle of the one, and their highneſſes of the other. So, that here we have a proof of the licence, and latitude of its application; and there is no reaſon to conclude, that it never was uſed to individuals of inferior rank, to the perſonages alluded to.

Beſides Mr. Malone's argument is preciſely this; that the *moſt common* addreſs to peers of the degree of dukes, being that of "your grace," it follows that Shakſpeare according to the MSS, muſt have been groſſly ignorant of the ſtyle, in which noblemen were addreſſed. Now, if ever a concluſion was completely diſclaimed by the premiſes, it is this, which Mr. Malone has hazarded. The very circumſtance of, *your grace*, not being generally ſo applied, might probably be the reaſon

of

of Shakſpeare's uſing it here. Had Shakſpeare been a courtier, and familiarized to the phraſe and accents of high rank, it was ſurely the moſt innocent, and natural flattery he could uſe, to addreſs his patron in a ſtyle, ſuperior to that, which was literally appropriated to him. Or, if he was not habituated to the language of the court on theſe occaſions (which as far as appears from his education, and life, is the moſt probable hypotheſis), it is more likely ſtill, that he would uſe the language of flattery in his addreſs to Leiceſter. It was natural for him to apply a title, in which if he erred, he erred on the ſafe ſide, and which the inherent weakneſs of our nature would rather approve, as the tribute of a zealous though incorrect obeiſance, than the ill-placed compliments of untutored ruſticity.

This hyper-critic now objects to a tranſaction in which Lowine is concerned which appears in the receipts of Shakſpeare. It ſtates, that at the time this Maſter Lowine was rewarded "forre "his good ſervyces, ande well playinge, he was "juſt twelve years of age, and does not appear to "have joined the company till after the acceſſion "of King James." But as uſual, Mr. Malone brings forward no proof, which unqueſtionably aſcertains the time of his joining the company, ſo that no inference againſt the MSS is to be drawn from what

he

he is pleaſed to aſſert. That he might have at that time performed the part of Arthur in King John, or the Duke of York in Richard the third, will eaſily be admitted; or that he might have occaſionally taken female characters, which we know at that time were performed by young men. Beſides it appears from the MSS, that only the ſum of two ſhillings is ſet down for Maſter Lowine, a ſum, very inadequate indeed to the ſervices of an older performer, but which on the grounds of his extreme youth, was perhaps a ſufficient ſalary.

We now come to the note of hand of *John Hemynge*, not *Hemynges*, as our ſagacious commentator has it*.

" One moneth from the date hereof, I doe
" promyſe to paye to my good and worthye freynd
" John Hemynge, the ſum of five pounds and
" five ſhillings, Engliſh moneye, as a recompenſe
" for hys greate trouble, in ſettling and doinge
" much for me at the Globe Theatre, as alſo for
" hys trouble in goinge downe for me to Statford.

Witneſs my hand, Wm. Shakſpere.
September the nynth, 1589.

* See Appendix to Malone, where *Hemynges*, and *Hemynge*, occur in the ſame deed and as the ſame perſon.

On

On another paper is the following receipt, which is attached to the note of hand by three pieces of wax.

"Received of Maſter Wm. Shakſpeare, the "ſum of five pounds and five ſhillings, good En-"gliſh money, thys nynth day of October, 1589.

"Jn°. Hemynge."

As to the ſignature of the poet, differing in this note from the reſt laid before the public, and for the "firſt and laſt time ſpelt in his own genuine "manner;" I have it in my power to ſhew many inſtances, in which the name is ſpelt in this mode, in ſeveral other papers which I have not publiſhed; I have however, amply ſhewn in a former part of this volume, the unſettled and indeterminate ſtate of our old orthography; and the numerous variations, which at that time it admitted. With regard to the alledged difference of hand-writing in the ſignatures, the ſpecimens will be found with a very ſlight examination, to differ from each other, in the ſame degree only as the ſignature of the ſame individual would at different times. And what ſtreſs can properly be laid upon a point ſo minute and frivolous as the accidental omiſſion of the letter (r) in Stratford? Did Mr. Malone himſelf never omit a letter in the haſte and negligence of writing?

But

But the obſervations, in which I ſhall next follow him, are very extraordinary. "Need I "call your attention" ſays the critic, to the "ſum of five guineas, here in fact, though not in "words promiſed to be paid?" Now let any one turn to the receipt, and ſee how far the ſtatement is true and correct in mere point of fact. Does it appear that the ſum of five guineas is promiſed to be paid? The accidental ſum paid for the ſpecified ſervices being five pounds and five ſhillings; who ſhall ſay, that the ſum of five guineas is repreſented in the receipt? For inſtance in the extract, Mr. Malone has given us, from the Royal Houſehold Eſtabliſhments, p. 255, the joiner's fee is ſet down 19*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.* and the record 16*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* Will any one ſay that the former of theſe ſums repreſented nineteen guineas, and the other ſixteen guineas and eight pence? Now unfortunately for the argument, it will appear from his own Prologomena, vol. 2, p. 254, in the account of monies received by Phil. Henſlowe, that there is this ſtatement

"26 of Deſember, 1591,"
"*Received at the ſege of London* iiii*l.*: iii*s.*: 0*d.*"

and were it not a ſubject beneath attention, I make no doubt, that I could produce from antient records innumerable inſtances of the ſame nature;

equally ſenſeleſs, and fatal to his own cauſe, is the aſſertion, that xxi ſhillings, or cv ſhillings was the moſt uſual mode of writing. Now the beſt anſwer to this, will be to refer him to the Prologomena, where it appears from the ſame extracts, 1591, that the accounts were kept in pounds, ſhillings, and pence. In ſhort, it comparatively occurs in very few inſtances, where the accounts kept in ſhillings are above the number of xx.

A great emphaſis is laid on the fac-ſimile of Hemynge's hand-writing, which the moment he ſaw it, the critic inſtinctively pronounced not to be genuine. Then we find him groping about the Prerogative Office, where he did not find what he looked for; though as I have before obſerved from good authority, that had he been ſucceſsful in his ſearch, he could not have decyphered them. But we are informed, that to prove the *Hemynge* ſhould have been *Heminges*; he was furniſhed from Mr. A. Wallis with a deed of John Heminges, dated Feb. 10, 1617-18, and of which he has given an autograph in plate 2, in which he has ſagaciouſly diſcovered, that "there is no more ſimilitude be-"tween the two ſignatures, than Hebrew, or Chi-"neſe characters have to Engliſh." And here let me requeſt the reader to attend to this diſcovery, and obſerve the critic caught in his own net.

On Wedneſday 30th of December 1795, Mr. Wallis,

Wallis, accompanied by Mr. Troward, requeſted to ſee me upon particular buſineſs. When they entered the room, Mr. Wallis apparently in a jocoſe manner, and directing his hand to his pocket, exclaimed, "I have ſomething here that "will deſtroy the validity of your Shakſpeare "papers." He then produced the deed quoted by Mr. Malone, ſigned John Heminges, which I obſerved was totally unlike the ſignature of Hemynge, I had laid before the public. Mr. Wallis was then ſhewn four receipts or memorandums, ſigned John Heminges, (which exactly correſponded with the hand-writing in his deed), one of which ſtood in this form, dated in the year 1602-3.

"Hadde fromm Maſter Shakſpeare for uſe of "the Curtayne, the fomm of fortenn ſhillings."

dated

Octobree 12, 1602.

Theſe four receipts are thus indorſed, "Payde "as hereinn mentyonedde, Wm. S." and are wrapped in another paper, on which is written "Receipts forre moneyes givenne toe mee bye "the *talle Heminge*, onne accounte o the Cur-"tayne Theatre."

Wm. S.

Among theſe papers, there are at leaſt twenty other memorandums, or diſburſements of monies, in which this perſon, Heminges is always diſtinguiſhed as the *tall Heminges* of the Curtain Theatre, from the Hemynge I have laid before the world in my publication. Beſides theſe documents I have the ſame Heminges as a ſubſcribing witneſs to ſeveral parchment deeds, with Shakſpeare and others. Now in conſequence of Mr. Wallis having in his poſſeſſion the deed before mentioned, I was well aware, that it would be a high dainty to our critic, to have an opportunity of nibbling at the parchment; I therefore, requeſted that gentleman very earneſtly, that Mr. Malone might be permitted to copy, or make any other uſe of this deed, that he might think proper. I was deſirous alſo of putting ſome deeds of my own into his hands, which I knew he would very willingly copy as proofs againſt me; but out of motives of mere compaſſion, I deſiſted from my intention. Well, Mr. Wallis politely permitted him to take a copy of the deed, and in conſequence, in Plate 2, No. 6, he has moſt aſſuredly given the autograph with conſiderable *fidelity*. It is amuſing, therefore, to ſee him like a whale rolling about in the depths of his own blunders: and entering into an elaborate proof to ſhew that the s final was in common uſe at that time, to account for its being written *He-*

minges.

minges. But this is another proof of his ignorance, of the orthography of proper names at that time, even as they were printed. Had he looked to the editor's dedication prefixed to the firſt folios, he would have there found the name thus ſpelled, without the s final *Heminge.* And ſo indefinite was the orthography at that period, that in the liſt of Actors in the ſame vol. he is called *Heminges.* In p. 140 of Mr. Malone's work, he ſays, that Heminge was married to Rebecca *Nuell,* widow. Now, as a proof that this ingenious gentleman cannot read, I would remark, that the original MS has it Rebecca Knell, widdow. Then in a ſtyle of banter in which he is not very ſucceſsful, he attacks poor Heminge with want of gallantry in leaving his wife to go down to Statford.

Are then the attachments of our amorous commentator ſo cloſely rivetted, that in the ſecond year of his marriage, no urgency of buſineſs ſhould divert him from the arms and the bed of his miſtreſs, even for a few nights? and with regard to his objection to the accidental uſe of Statford, I cannot help obſerving the curious changes which he rings upon the objectionable authority, when in one ſentence he finds fault with their being redundant, at another, with their being deficient in the letters. But, as he ſays p. 132, " I will leave this

to

to be determined " by ſome one better verſed in " decyphering nonſenſe, than I am."

Mr. Malone now comes to an objection, on which by the aſſiſtance of ſome ingenious friend, he has been enabled very amply to expatiate. Very luckily, he ſays, that he has diſcovered the form of a promiſſory note at that period, and as the note among the MSS does not conform in every reſpect to it, he very ſagaciouſly concludes, that it was forged for the occaſion. Let us obſerve the ſpecimen given by Mr. Malone.

Mem. " That I Gabrell Spencer the 5th of " Aprell have borrowed of Philippe Henſlowe " the ſum of thirtie ſhellynges in redy money to " be payed unto him agayne, *when he ſhall demande* " *yt.* I ſaye borrowed xxxs.

" Gabricel Spencer."

This is copied as Mr. Malone ſtates, from Henſlowe's MS Regiſter.

Then he gives an inſtance of a note or bill of debt, payable one month after date.

" The 1 and twentieth daye of Septtember, " a thouſand ſix houndard, borrowed of Mr. " Henſhlowe in redii monie the ſom of fortie

" ſhellings

" ſhellings to be paid the twentie daie of October " next folleinge the date herof, in witneſs herof, " I ſet to my hand.

" John Duke."

Another form was,—" Received 30 die Ja- " nuarii 1598 of —— the ſum of —— to bee re- " payed unto him, or his aſſignes upon the laſt of " Febuary, next enſuinge, whereof I bind me, my " heires, executors, and adminiſtrators." None of theſe it is ſaid, whether entered in the book of the lender, or written on ſeparate ſlips of paper, were indorſable over, nor could an action at law be maintained on them.

To this laſt obſervation, I take no exception. I do not contend that the memorandums in the Shakſpeare MSS were legal or transferable ſecurities. All I contend for is, that there can be no deciſive proof that this form of acknowledgement of a debt, or a promiſe to repay it, might not have been uſed at that time, notwithſtanding what is ſaid to diſprove or invalidate it, either by Mr. Malone himſelf, or by his ingenious friend.

But the two authorities claſh with each other, and according to all the rules of ſtrict reaſoning,

as

as well as of ſtrict evidence, are mutually deſtructive of the ſeveral proofs they adduce. In the elaborate hiſtory of promiſſory notes, which is thrown into the lumber of an appendix, inſtead of framing a connected ſyſtem of argument in his text, it is laid down as a ſort of axiom, that in the period on which we are occupied, it was eſſential to every inſtrument of this kind, that it ſhould contain a clauſe to expreſs the ſealing of the paper. For inſtance. "In witneſs whereof I ſet to my "ſeale, &c." It is obſervable that this is alſo taken from Henſlowe's Regiſter. Now in the bill of debt, which Mr. Malone himſelf has exhibited, there is no ſuch clauſe as this inſerted, nor does it appear that the inſtrument was ſealed by the party, who was bound by it. Here then are two contradictory authorities. The ingenious friend ſays that every inſtrument muſt have been ſealed, and that none exiſted without it. The critic himſelf produces a ſpecimen, where there is no clauſe relative to ſealing at all; and what is very remarkable, both of them ſeem to have been exploring the ſame records; and each produces a ſpecimen, which falſifies and invalidates that of the other.

Mr. Malone from the nature of his objection, appears to me entirely ignorant of the law, hiſtory, and commerce, of the country. He does not conſider that the antient uſages of a bill or

promiſe

promiſe to pay, or to do any thing, becauſe there was by ſtatute law, no definite and preſcribed form of writing them; on that very account, were by conſequence uncertain and variable. He ſeems to ſuppoſe that the origin and uſe of notes was not prior to the ſtatutes which made them negotiable, viz. the ſtatutes 9th and 10th, William 3d, and 3d and 4th, Anne, c. 51. Theſe ſtatutes firſt made them negotiable, but it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe that they were in exiſtence before this period, as the 9th and 10th, William and Mary, c. 7, which, " is entitled an act for the better payment " of inland bills of exchange," preſcribes no ſpecific form, but merely creates proviſions to give them a legal negotiation and effect.

Without the aid of the dull reaſoning in the appendix, I am ready to acknowledge, that the promiſſory note did not exiſt legally at this period, and I am alſo ready to allow, that among merchants, it was not the uſual mode of giving ſecurities, or of acknowledging debts. Among thoſe, who were engaged in commerce, it is natural to ſuppoſe, that no inſtrument would be in general uſe, but what was recognized by law. But the ſame reaſoning does not apply with equal force to tranſactions between individuals. It is ſtated, that the want of theſe promiſſory notes, &c. was very ſeverely felt in the mercantile world, and

the inconvenience of ſealed obligations a conſiderable matter of complaint. This inconvenience muſt have been much more ſeverely experienced in the pecuniary intercourſes of thoſe, who did not ſtand in a mercantile relation to each other. By conſequence therefore, ſome mode of acknowledging the receipt of monies on one hand, or of promiſing to pay them on the other, would naturally be reſorted to, where a mutual confidence exiſted. The notes &c. in the Shakſpeare MSS merely relate to a private tranſaction between two very intimate friends. The ſums were ſmall, and neither of the parties thought it neceſſary to clothe their contracts in the inconvenient ſhape of ſtrict legal rules. This very often happens at the preſent moment. I have myſelf often ſeen the vowels I, O, U, with the ſum of money annexed; and this has been the only acknowledgement between the parties, and that to a very conſiderable amount. As theſe papers are not put into circulation, they are frequently kept in a deſk or drawer, by way of a mere private memorandum.

Having diſmiſſed this topic, on which I truſt that the remarks I have made, will be equally clear and ſatisfactory, I now proceed to the letter to Anna Hatherway. Here Mr. Malone invokes Venus, her ſon and all the loves, and the graces. The firſt time I believe, ſo ill-omened an

invo-

invocation was ever addreſſed to theſe perſonages. Commentators, and critics are not in general the ardent votaries, nor the favoured choice of the beautiful divinity. Nor is it very uſual to invoke the inſpiration of this goddeſs, to ſubjects of recondite and abſtruſe reſearches into black letter, from whence the illuminations of genius, and taſte, and ſcience are neceſſarily excluded. But leaving this ridiculous topic, let us attend to the objections the critic takes to the letter, I have alluded to. The letter is as follows.

" Deareſte Anna

" As thou haſte alwaye founde mee toe mye
" worde moſte trewe ſoe thou ſhalt ſee I havee
" ſtryctlye kepte mye promyſe I pray you per-
" fume thys mye poore locke withe thye balmye
" kyſſes forre thenne indeede ſhalle kynges
" themmeſelves bowe ande paye homage toe itte.
" I doe aſſure thee no rude hande hathe knottedde
" itte thye Willy's alone hathe done the worke
" Neytherre the gyldedd bauble thatte envyronnes
" the heade of majeſtye noe norre honourres moſt
" weyghtye would give mee halfe the joye as didde
" thys mye lyttle worke forre thee The feelinge
" that dydde neareſte approache untoe itte was
" thatte whiche commethe nygheſte untoe God
" meeke ande gentle charytye forre thatte virtue

" O! Anna doe I love doe I cheryſhe thee inne
" mye hearte forre thou art ass a talle cedarre,
" ſtretchynge forthe its branches and ſuccourynge
" the ſmallere plants frome nyppynge winneterre
" orr the boyſterouſe windes Farewelle toe
" morrowe bye tymes I will ſee thee tille thenne
" Adewe ſweete Love.

" Thyne everre.
" Wm. Shakſpeare."
" Anna Hatherrewaye."

Upon the internal ſtyle of the letter, as it is natural to expect, the critic makes no obſervation. Of the ſolid ſenſe, with which it abounds, the marks of a pregnant intellect which it diſplays, and the beauty of its diction, and imagery, he takes no cognizance. He is ſtill *apud minima*. With a taſte ſimilar to his, who in examining the beauties of an ancient temple, ſhould inſpect the ſtones of which it was built, and analyze the mortar which cemented them together, he attempts to pick out a flaw in the orthography, and ſuperſcription. Or, to uſe a more ludicrous compariſon as Prior has it of a twelfth-cake

He is but an *idle dreamer*,
Who leaves the pye, to gnaw the ſtreamer.

As a ſpecimen of this " obſcure diligence,"

I would

I would juſt point out the frivolous exception to the letter, on the ſcore of its omitting in the ſuperſcription the uſual prepoſitions *For* and *To*. I leave this exception without commenting upon it. Then we are told, by way of farther objection, that the lady was chriſtened plain Anne not *Anna*; and that her name was not Hatherwaye but *Hathaway*.

I have not examined pariſh regiſters, nor looked into mouldy records, to aſcertain the preciſe manner, in which ſhe was chriſtened. But this does not interfere with the argument, for names are not always pronounced with the pronunciation which was uſed at the chriſtening. Beſides there are innumerable inſtances, in which vernacular names are pronounced with a Roman termination. But this advocate for the fame of the immortal bard, according to the character he has arrogated to himſelf, might have recollected that names were frequently written in this mode by Shakſpeare himſelf, in ſeveral of his dramas. Let him look to his Taming the Shrew.

" Thou art to me as ſecret and as dear,
" As ANNA to the Queen of Carthage was."
Act. 2. Sc. 4.

Have we not alſo *Iſabella*, for Iſabel? *Mariana*

riana for Marianne, in Meaſure for Meaſure? *Katharina* in the Taming of the Shrew. *Maria* in Love's Labour Loſt. Ditto, Twelfth Night. For *Anna* Queen of Great Britain, ſee Taylor the Water Poet, f. ed. p. 250. *Anna Maria* Eſtouteville, and *Henrietta Maria*, daughter of Thomas Savage, Viſcount Rock Savage, both born the end of the 16th, or the beginning of the 17th century. Theſe inſtances I am furniſhed with by F. Townſend, Eſq. Windſor Herald.

Again we find in the Pariſh Regiſter of St. Botolph Biſhopſgate, "Anna ——— one of the "nunnies maides of St. Mary Spital, buried 20th "of October, 1613. Theſe inſtances, will I think, ſhew to conviction the frequent uſe of theſe names, of *Anna* in particular, of which Mr. Malone has dogmatically ſaid that *in plain proſe*, no example can be produced in the ſixteenth century. Yet ſurely the letter to Anne Hatherwaye is not plain proſe. If that can only be called poetry, which is expreſſed in certain metre, and cadence, this is certainly proſe, and probably this gentleman has no other criterion to diſtinguiſh between poetry, and proſe. But if by poetry, be meant that, which breathes inſpiration, and is clothed in a ſort of numerous diction though not regular verſification, then the letter I am ſpeaking of, is ſurely a poetical compoſition.

With

With regard to the exceptionable ſpelling of *Hatherrewaye*, I ſhall not treſpaſs much on the attention of the reader, by entering into minute diſquiſition concerning it. This only I will remark, as far as the remark can apply to the ſubject of the MSS, that Ben Jonſon's name is frequently written in papers which I have in my poſſeſſion, Johnſonne, and even the name of Harcourt, whoſe name is ſo ſpelled in a printed book, intitled, a Voyage to Guiana, has in a note immediately under it, in the very hand-writing of the Shakſpeare MSS, the word ſpelt *Harrecourte*. Now, not to lay any emphaſis on the queſtion of the authenticity or impoſture of the papers, is not this unuſual mode of orthography as reconcileable to the one as to the other hypotheſis? for, what forger in his ſenſes would have betrayed ſo groſs an improvidence, as to diſplay errors, which muſt have directly militated againſt his own purpoſes. And though our critic is ſo very confident, that the erroneous orthography of this name, is a ſufficient proof of the impoſture, it is no ſtronger proof to a candid mind than the ſpelling of Lowine, Leyceſterre, or Shakſpeare in ſeveral oppoſite and contradictory ways.

But, ſays Mr. Malone, had the addreſs been "my *ſweet* Anne," inſtead of *deareſt*, it might have paſſed well enough. In ſupport of this frivolous remark,

remark, he cites Sir John Harrington, who begins his letter to his lady, dated December 27, 1602, with the words "Sweet Mall." In reply to this, I ſhall refer Mr. Malone to Lodge's Illuſtrations, where he will find in vol. 2. p. 102, in the Earl of Derby's letter, the words "Deareſt Friend," uſed in 1589: again in the ſame volume p. 72, we ſhall find "Deareſte Py." In Nicol's Elizabeth's Progreſs, p. 7, in Churchyard's Pleaſaunt Comedie, "My Deere, adiew.

But to quit the ſubject, we will refer this critic to his own quotations, particularly in p. 56, where Sir Philip Sidney addreſſes his Siſter, "*To my deare* Lady and Siſter the Counteſſe of "Pembroke." But it is of all labours, the moſt wearisome, and certainly the leaſt inſtructive, to occupy our underſtandings about ſuch miſerable traſh. In a note, it is obſerved by the critic, that the forgery is proved by the fact, namely, of miſnomers, orthographies, &c. notwithſtanding the reaſons that might be adduced in ſupport of them. Admirable reaſoning! But how my good critic, is this fact proved? Is it by my Lady Barnard's Will, or by the old Pariſh Regiſter, which contains the marriage of a perſon, who is not even known to belong to that family? Let us leave him, however, to his regiſters and prerogative indexes.

Now

Now with regard to the orthography of the poet's name (once more to recur to this topic) can any rational man conclude, that Heminge and Condell, the editors and printers of Shakſpeare's works, were forgers, becauſe they ſpelt his name *Shakeſpeare?* though in the only admitted autographs of the bard, he himſelf wrote it Shakſpere and Shakſpeare. And by the ſame reaſon in the inſtance before us, namely, the ſpelling of Hatherwaye, can the orthography of her name, not as it was written in her own hand, but as it was found in the will of a deſcendant, in the third degree of generation from her, be according to any ſound principles of logic, or evidence, conſidered as a forgery?

But not content with digreſſing from his ſubject by invocations to Venus, and the Graces, we now find our critic introducing his political opinions into the controverſy before us. In truth, there ſeems ſome little ingenuity in the mode of procedure, which he has adopted. He ſeems to have known, that if all the reſearches he has expended on the ſubject, the minute, and laboured criticiſms he has purſued, for the purpoſe of invalidating the MSS, ſhould be but little attended to, and their effect on the queſtion but ſlightly eſtimated, to introduce his political tenets, and to ſhew a ſeditious tendency in ſome paſſage of the MSS would

excite a powerful, and efficient prejudice againſt them. For this purpoſe, he introduces himſelf as a zealous royaliſt; and has ſelected a paſſage of the above letter, to which he imputes a ſeditious conſtruction. The words which he marks out as a contemptuous alluſion to royalty are thoſe of "*gyl-*"*dedde bawbles.*" Let me, however, requeſt the reader to peruſe the paſſage. None, but the moſt ſervile courtier, can ſurely take an exception to any phraſe of this kind. In calling the crown a gilded bawble, Shakſpeare only repeated, what he has frequently ſaid in his dramas. Who is there that will mark out for animadverſion every ſentiment, which concerns the emptineſs of royalty, and that occurs not only in this poet, but which muſt occur in the works of all, who have ſtudied human life, and drawn rational reflections from the peruſal of it? Who for inſtance, could make this objection to the ſpeech of Richard II.

——— Within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king,
Keeps death his court, and there the antic ſits,
Scoffing his ſtate, and grinning at his pomp, &c.
Act. 3. Sc. 4.

Still purſuing his digreſſion, Mr. Malone attempts

tempts to give an eulogium on the character of Queen Elizabeth. As he has provoked the ſubject, I truſt, that a ſlight obſervation on the character of this princeſs, will be allowed me in my turn. It is intimated by Mr. Malone, that time may have abated the ſplendor of her name. Perhaps there is no better proof than this, that the ſplendor of her character was temporary and adventitious, rather than durable and ſolid. The moſt unequivocal teſt, to which the general policy or perſonal character of a ſovereign can be brought, is the eſtimate of a fair, and unbiaſſed poſterity; becauſe it is an eſtimate, into which no temporary prepoſſeſſions, no heats of party, or faction can poſſibly enter. It is indeed ſomewhat remarkable that the example of this princeſs, whom every hiſtorian has repreſented to have been more tenacious, of the royal prerogative, and more avaricious of arbitrary ſway, than any of her predeceſſors, ſhould be held up as an object of ſuch ardent veneration. I know not how to account for it, but by attributing it to the new faſhioned propenſity, not only to contemplate with complacency, but even with admiration, thoſe periods of our hiſtory, in which the liberties of the people were the moſt overlooked, or deſpiſed. Mr. Malone in his abhorrence of regicide, ought not to have forgot the cruel murder of the Scottiſh Queen, in which a lawful

and aimiable ſovereign was depoſed by the artful, and jealous policy of the princeſs, of whom he is ſo violently enamoured. The reign of this queen, however, was proſperous, in the wars ſhe entered into, and the commerce of the country was conſiderably extended at that period. This will account for the predilections to this princeſs. So true is it that a combination of proſperous circumſtances, will throw a ſort of magnificence over a government, the adminiſtration of which is uniformly conducted on the moſt arbitrary, and tyrannical principles. With regard to the " deteſtable doc- " trines of modern republicans," which our critic ſeems ſo thoroughly to apprehend, I ſhall only obſerve that if the cauſe of regular governments, has no better ſupport, than the pen of an half informed and cloudy commentator, it ſtands in a ſtate deplorably precarious, and diſſoluble.

But to return to the verbal objections of the critic. On the uſe of the word " bawble," in the letter to Anna Hatherwaye, he obſerves, that he has ſome doubt, whether the word had obtained that ſignification, ſo early as the middle of the reign of Elizabeth. He doubts whether it was uſed at that time, though in the foregoing ſentence, he allows that it bears the very ſenſe affixed to it in ſeveral of our poet's plays. Why, however, the world is to be ſatisfied with the doubts of this

gentleman,

gentleman, I am at a loſs to diſcover, and I am equally perplexed to diſcern upon what principles his doubts, unaccompanied as they are even with the ſhadow of an argument, can operate againſt my reaſonings. In p. 14. we have produced inſtances ſufficient to ſhew that the word *Bawble* was in uſe in Elizabeth's time, and long before that period, and was applied exactly in the ſenſe, in which it is uſed in the MSS. In Cymbeline, a play the commentator ſhould certainly have had ſome knowledge of, we find

" Richer than doing nothing, for a *bauble*,
" Prouder than ruſtling in unpaid for ſilk."

Another inſtance I ſhall here adduce, (though it is ſcarcely neceſſary) to prove the word was in very common uſe in 1633. In the index of words prefixed to Butler's Engliſh Grammar printed in that year, and which conſiſts of only twelve leaves, we find under letter B. To Babble, Garrio, a *Bawble*, Nugamentum.

With regard to the objection, that *gilded* is an unſuitable epithet to diadem, and that Shakſpeare muſt have known that the diadem always conſiſted of real gold, I ſhall make but one obſervation. It is evident from the ſenſe to which it is applied in the letter before us, that the epithet, " *gilded*," was

uſed

uſed in a derogatory manner, in order to degrade the value of the object to which he alludes. It is a figure in rhetoric, which Quintillian and Tully call the *imminutio*; and had Mr. Malone read the works of either of theſe writers, he would not ſurely have tried a mere metaphorical diction, by the teſt of rigid truth, to which it is abſurd to bring either figurative, or rhetorical expreſſion.

In order to ſhew, however, that the prevalent opinions of our author's age, were inconſiſtent with the ſentiment in the letter to Anne Hatherwaye, we have many quotations from Shakſpeare. But how looſe unconnected extracts from various plays, can demonſtrate the real ſentiments of the author, I cannot diſcover. When Shakſpeare wrote his dramas, he would naturally put into the mouths of his theatrical perſonages, the ſentiments which were the moſt congenial to their reſpective characters. He knew, that unleſs he was governed by this principle, the unity of character and action, which is the moſt prominent merit of Shakſpeare, would be violated and deſtroyed. He attributed, therefore, to his dramatic agents, their appropriate expreſſions. When a biſhop ſpeaks, Shakſpeare provided him with the language of paſſive ſubmiſſion to the reigning authority which it is natural for a biſhop to utter. In the lips of his ſove-

reigns,

reigns, he has put the diction of a conſcious, and dignified ſuperiority; in thoſe of his courtiers, the maxims of pliant and accomodating ſervility. Hence it is, that in the writings of Shakſpeare, it is eaſy to ſelect paſſages, in which the moſt ſervile, and ſubmiſſive principles are inculcated. But on the other hand, it is by no means difficult to find ſentiments, which breathe the ſpirit of a proud and dignified independence. Paſſages of this kind may be found in Julius Cæſar, and in many other plays, where it was neceſſary for the preſervation of that unity of character, which appears in all his dramas, that appropriate ſentiments and expreſſion ſhould be uſed.

But we have alſo an objection to the uſe of the word "cedar," and to the phraſe "forre thou arte as "a talle cedarre ſtretchynge forthe its branches and "ſuccourynge ſmaller plants fromme nypyngge "winterre, or the boyſterouſe windes. It is ſaid "that an umbrageous multitude of leaves, inſtead "of ſuccouring deſtroys all vegetation under it." This is not true. Mr. Malone has proved himſelf not only ignorant of natural hiſtory, but even incapable of the moſt obvious reflection. Vegetation, every one knows, requires air; this is evident from the propenſity, which naturaliſts have obſerved in all plants, and ſhrubs, to bend towards the air, when they are ſituated in places, which

which do not admit a general circulation and diffuſion of that fluid. But we are yet to learn, that the ſhelter of a tree is unfavourable to the growth of ſmaller ſhrubs and plants. Ivy, Jeſſamine, the Roſe-tree, and Ever-greens, flouriſh always in the ſhade. This would-be critic here finds fault with what he cannot underſtand. I muſt firſt remind him of the maxim of the ſchools, "Nullum "ſimile eſt idem," or to tranſlate it to him, "That which reſembles any thing, cannot be the "ſame." If he finds fault with the above beautiful paſſage, what will he ſay to the following effort of a great maſter? "My love is "as the cypreſs in the garden, like the horſe in "the chariots of Theſſaly." I muſt now inform this God of Letters, that, if a reſemblance is exact throughout, it is not any longer, poetically ſpeaking a ſimile. Has he forgot the objection againſt Addiſon's angel, or does he not know it? Perhaps he may not. But to anſwer him incontrovertibly, at leaſt in his own way, I aſſert, that ſome ever-greens and other plants will thrive beneath the ſhady branches of trees; and that in moſt counties famous for the production of apples, in order to ſave ground, grain is ſown in the orchards, which does not ſeem to flouriſh the leſs from being ſo ſituated: and, laſt of all, he muſt be requeſted to peruſe the lines in queſtion again, and he will find,

that

that in them the cedar is ſuppoſed only to defend the ſmaller plants " fromme nyppynge winneterre, " or the boyſterouſe windes;" and not to ſuccour vegetation, as he miſunderſtood them. It is rational to infer, that when they are protected from the cold blaſts, and in ſouthern climates from the intenſe rays of the ſun, they would be more likely to thrive in their young and tender ſtate. That vegetation, however, does flouriſh under this ſpecies of covering, is evident from the immenſe quantity of underwood, or low ſhrubs, which will be obſerved in all woods and foreſts, where there is a great deal of ſhade, and protection afforded them by the larger trees. Leaving however, this ſpecies of digreſſion, let us now examine the verſes by Shakſpeare, to Anna Hatherwaye.

" Is there inne heavenne aught more rare
" Thanne thou ſweete nymphe of Avon fayre,
" Is there onne earthe a manne more trewe,
" Thanne Willy Shakſpeare is to you.

" Though fyckle fortune prove unkynde
" Still dothe ſhe leave herre wealthe behynde
" She neere the hearte canne forme anew
" Norre make thye Willy's love untrue.

" Though age withe withered hand doe ſtryke,
" The forme moſte fayre the face moſte bryghte,
" Stille dothe ſhe leave untouchedde and trewe
" Thy Willy's love ande friendſhippe too.

" Though deathe with neverre faylynge blowe
" Dothe Manne and babe alyke brynge lowe
" Yette doth he take naughte butte hys due
" Ande ſtrikes notte Willy's hearte ſtill trewe.

" Synce thenne norre forretune death norre age
" Canne faythfulle Willy's love aſſuage
" Then doe I live ande dye forre you
" Thy Willye ſyncere ande moſt trewe."

The firſt verbal exception to theſe ſtanzas, is the uſe of " Heavenne" as a dyſſillable. The exception is founded on the authority of Spenſer. " In his letter to Gabriel Harvey, April 1580" " *Heaven* being uſed ſhort as one ſyllable, when it is " in verſe ſtretched with a diaſtole, is like a lame " dog that holdeth up one leg. In our poet's ge- " nuine compoſitions, we never find any ſuch hob- " bling metre," obſerves the commentator on Shakſpeare. To what purpoſe he has read this great maſter will be ſeen, from the ſpecimens I ſhall adduce, to ſhew that it is uſed indiſcriminately as a diſſylable and monyſyllable in various paſſages of his plays.

The means, that *Heaven* yields muſt be embraced,
And not neglected: elſe if *Heaven* would,
And we would not *Heavn's* offer, we refuſe
The proffered means of ſuccour, and redreſs.

King Richard II. Act 3. Sc. 2.

— Oh!

——————— Oh! you are men of ſtones,
Had I your tongues, and eyes, I'd uſe them ſo,
That *Heaven*'s vault ſhould crack: ſhe's gone for ever.
Lear. Act. 5.

Now let the rain of *Heaven* wet this place,
To waſh away my woeful monuments.
Henry VI. Part 2. Act. 3.

By *Heaven* I had rather coin my heart,
And drop my blood for drachmas, than to wring
From the hard hands of peaſants, their vile traſh
By any indirection.
Julius Cæſar, Act. 4.

The Sun not yet thy ſighs from *Heaven* clears.
Romeo and Juliet, Act. 2. Sc. 3.

Why e'en in that was *Heaven* ordinant.
Hamlet, Act. 5.

He finds the joys of *Heaven* here on earth.
Merchant of Venice.

I cannot 'twixt the *Heaven*, and the Main
Deſcry a ſail.
Othello, Act. 2.

I have tow'rd *Heaven* breath'd a ſecret vow.
Othello, Act. 2.

By *Heaven* I will ne'er come in your bed,
Untill I ſee the King.
Merchant of Venice, Act. 5.

Study is like the *Heaven*'s glorious Sun.
Love's Labour Loſt, Act. 1.

Theſe earthly Godfathers of *Heaven*'s lights.
ibid.

Heaven would in little ſhew
Therefore *Heaven*'s nature's charg'd.
As You Like it. Act. 3. Sc.

Hymen from *Heaven* brought her.
ibid.

Make *Heaven* drowſy with the Harmony.
Love's Labour Loſt.

And Beauty's creſt becomes the *Heavens* well.
ibid.

What peremptory eagle-ſighted eye
Dares look upon the *Heaven* of her brow.
Love's Labour Loſt.

——————— In vaine do men
The *Heavens* of their fortunes fault accuſe.
Spenſer.

Looke

Looke when the *Heavens* are to juſtice bent.
Ibid.

The ſunne that meaſures *Heaven* all day long
At night doth bath his ſteeds, th' ocean waves among.
Ibid.

At laſt the golden Orientall gate
Of greateſt *Heaven* gan to open fayre,
And Phœbus freſh as bridegroome to her mate,
Came dauncing forth, ſhaking his dewie haire,
And hurles his gliſtering beames through gloomie ayre.
Ibid.

——————— Now the golden Heſperus
Was mounted hie in toppe of *Heaven*'s ſheene.
Ibid.

It was the time, when reſt ſoft ſliding downe
From *Heaven*'s height, into man's heavie eyes
Ibid.

——————— Her angel's face
As the great eye of *Heaven* ſhined bright.
Ibid.

What ſo the *Heavens* in this ſecret doombe,
Ordained have, how can fraile fleſhy wight
Forecaſt, but it muſt needs to iſſue come.
Ibid.

Why have I quoted theſe inſtances? I have quoted

quoted them to ſhew that this gentleman, who we ought to ſuppoſe, is too converſant with Shakſpeare, not to have met with theſe paſſages, has made an aſſertion, which every page almoſt of this author falſifies and deſtroys. It were to be wiſhed that this critic and hiſtorian of *Lowine*, could be made to know ſomething about what he writes, before he begins ſcribbling, he would then contrive to get ſome underſtanding of the author of whom he ſpeaks. He would then know that Spenſer has taken this licence in as large a latitude as any of his neighbours,

" Like as a tender roſe in open plaine
" Diſpreds the glory of her *leaves* gaye."

This is dilatation, this is diaſtole with a vengeance. But what reliance in any reſpect, is to be had in the genius of vocabulary and dictionary? old and new, from Romeus and Juliet to Samuel Johnſon, he has written and read " a world of " wordes;" but what does he know in any reſpect of the uſe of them? that he knows nothing of the meaſure of either Shakſpeare or Spenſer, is here demonſtrated, and yet he dreams that he is as familiar with them as his glove, and, as if they were ſworn companions. We have ſeen that thoſe who are utterly incapable of reaſoning, can very glibly

glibly enumerate and run over the names of our old logicians; and Cockeran or Coles may help him to the meaning of the words, ſyſtole and diaſtole, whom no ſchooling, no drudgery, no reading or tranſcribing, can make feel the harmony of numbers.

Not long after the critic's publication of his enquiry, we find him recanting his aſſertion, and proclaiming his ignorance through the medium of the Gentleman's Magazine, acknowledging that he recollects the uſe of the word in Macbeth.

" Hear it not Duncan, for it is a knell,
" That ſummons thee to *Heaven*, or to Hell.

And does this retractation atone for the temerity of making bold, and unſupported blunders, on a ſubject to which one might imagine from his peculiar ſtudy and avocation, he would have paid a ſtricter and more diligent attention. It appears rather extraordinary, that a commentator on Shakſpeare, ſhould convict himſelf of having never read him.

The next paper in the order purſued by Mr. Malone, is the

Letter from Shakſpeare to the
Earl of Southampton;
and the
Earl's anſwer.

Here

Here we come once more to aſſertions, urged if poſſible with encreaſed arrogance, and more deſtitute than ever of proof, or reaſon. It is ſaid, that there is not a ſingle circumſtance belonging to theſe letters, that does not detect and expoſe the impoſture. But the reader will ſmile, when he obſerves the extraordinary mode, in which this aſſeveration is attempted to be maintained. The reaſoning is not ſpecifically applicable to the letters before us, but comprehends the whole of the ſubject. It does not merely attach ſuſpicion to this part of the Shakſpeare documents, but overwhelms in one indiſcriminate torrent of refutation, the intire collection of manuſcripts altogether. What is this irreſiſtable argument? Stripping it of its uſeleſs incumbrance of words, and bringing it into a narrow compaſs, it is preciſely this. *I, Edmund Malone, having been employed on a life of Shakſpeare for two years paſt, and with the aid of authentic and indiſputable documents, (which the world has not yet ſeen) having overturned every traditional ſtory, concerning Shakſpeare for near a century paſt (which is yet to be proved) not being unconverſant with the ſubject, do pronounce theſe MSS to be ſpurious.*

Mr. Malone is pleaſed to conſider theſe letters as formed on ſome archetype, or received tradition concerning Shakſpeare. The letters in queſtion,

queſtion, he aſcribes to a tradition, tranſmitted from Sir William Davenant to Mr. Rowe, that Lord Southampton gave our author no leſs a ſum than one thouſand pounds. But how is this act of patronage and liberality diſproved? Why Mr. Malone is poſſeſſed of indiſputable documents, which prove what? that this liberality muſt have been greatly magnified, and that the ſtory in all its parts cannot be true. Now let me requeſt the reader to obſerve, in the firſt place that theſe *indiſputable documents* are not produced; that according to equitable rules of reaſoning, therefore they have no weight at all in the preſent argument. In the ſecond place, giving the critic credit for his *indiſputable documents*, and allowing that they prove the liberality of Southampton to have been exaggerated in this tradition, as far as the queſtion relates to the letters before us, they prove nothing at all, becauſe theſe letters ſpecify no ſum, but allude merely to an indefinite, though great act of bounty from the Earl to his friend Shakſpeare. But it is diverting to hear the critic preſcribe, in what order the correſpondence would have been conducted, had the poet received the mark of munificence from his noble patron, Firſt, ſays he, Lord Southampton's letter would ſpecify the ſum, which he had given, as a tribute to the talents of the great bard, and then we ſhould have ſeen the

poet's letter of thanks. On what grounds, does Mr. Malone aſſert that ſuch would have been the natural order of correſpondence? Muſt it have neceſſarily happened, that this bounty was communicated by a letter, or if it was communicated by letter, might not this letter have been loſt? But the inference which the commentator draws from the letters appearing in this order, is, that a ſpecific ſum muſt have been mentioned, and that the fabricator was well aware, "*that ſome inquiſitive reſearcher like myſelf,*" would be poſſeſſed of documents, which would immediately aſcertain the bounty to have been very different from the ſum fixed upon. Here we are again nauſeated with thoſe eternal references to his documents, with which Mr. Malone has tormented his readers, almoſt in every page of his work. In anſwer however to theſe objections, let me aſk, whether it is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the laws of human probability, that a nobleman of diſtinguiſhed rank, and more diſtinguiſhed for his patronage of ingenious and deſerving men, ſhould beſtow on an author, like Shakſpeare, a great, and ſignal munificence? And whether the bard, while all the emotions of gratitude were ſtruggling in his breaſt, might not expreſs his feelings in the letter, which for the ſecond time I here preſent to the public, together with the earl's reply.

Copye

Copye of mye letter toe hys grace offe Southampton.

Mye Lorde

Doe notte eſteeme me a ſluggarde nor tardye for thus havynge delayed to anſwerre or rather toe thank you for youre greate bountye I doe aſſure you my graciouſe and good lorde that thryce I have eſſayed toe wryte and thryche mye efforts have beene fruitleſſe I know notte what toe ſaye Proſe Verſe alle all is naughte gratitude is all I have toe utter and that is tooe great and tooe *ſublyme a feeling* for poore mortalls toe expreſs O my lord itte is a budde which blloſſommes blloms but never dyes itte cheriſhes ſweete nature and lulls the calme Breaſt to ſofte ſofte repoſe Butte mye goode lorde forgive thys mye departure fromme mye ſubjecte which was toe returne thankes and thankes I doe returne O excuſe mee mye lord more at preſentte I cannotte

Yours devotedlye and with due reſpecte
Wm. Shakſpeare

Lord Southampton's anſwer.

Deare Willam

I cannotte doe leſſe than thanke you forre youre kynde letterre butte whye deareſt Freynd

talke ſo much offe gratitude mye offerre was double the ſomme butte you woulde accept butte the halfe therefore you neede notte ſpeake ſoe muche on thatte ſubjectte as I have beene thye freynde ſoe I will continue aughte that I can doe forre thee pray commande mee and you ſhall fynde me.

Yours Southampton.

[Superſcribed]
" To the Globe Theatre
" For Maſter William
" Shakſpeare."

To the *orthography*, the objection of Mr. Malone is the ſame, as that which I conſidered in the former part of this work. As to the addreſs of " Your Grace" the reaſonings I have urged, on its uſe in the other letters, will apply with the ſame force to that, which is now under our conſideration.

Inſtead of " *Mye Larde*" with which the letter commences, it ſhould have been Right Honorable I ſhall not enter at large into this objection, becauſe this gentleman in the ſubſequent ſentence has ſaved me the trouble of adverting to it, by acknowledging that " *Right Honorable*" was not the only mode of that time, the other being ſometimes uſed. What credit is due to a writer, who in the very

very ſame ſentence hazards the moſt unqualified aſſertions, and the completeſt retractations to annul and falſify them?

The part of the letter, which next falls under our critic's animadverſion, are the following words "*thryce* I have eſſayed toe write, and *thryce* mye "efforts have been fruitleſſe." Theſe, he ſays, are borrowed from Ovid.

"Ter conata loqui, ter fletibus ora rigavit." But in a ſtyle of ſarcaſtic contempt, he obſerves, that he entirely acquits the author of ever having read Ovid, and that he was indebted to Milton's imitation of his favorite poet.

"Thrice he eſſayed, and thrice, in ſpight of ſcorn,
"Tears ſuch as Angels weep burſt forth."

There is perhaps no office in criticiſm, which is more truly contemptible, than that to which Mr. Malone, and other commentators have aſpired; I mean, that of tracing the diction of one author into that of another. They are a ſort of Bow-ſtreet runners in literature. They are employed in ſearching for ſtolen goods, where ever their ſagacity, which is not of the higheſt kind, may direct them. No ſubject of criticiſm therefore has been more abuſed, and none has been undertaken by weaker, or more taſteleſs illuſtrators. I do not deny,

deny, that the compariſon of parallel beauties, and the diſplay of ſtriking reſemblances in different writers may contribute to good taſte and to literature; nor can I deny, that this taſk has been executed by deep, and accompliſhed critics. But theſe great men have often allowed too liberal a ſcope for their own fancies and caprices on theſe topics; ſo that others, of no critical pretenſion, and no critical ſagacity, have been ſeduced by their example, and have exerted their unprofitable diligence, in following the ſuggeſtions of their own underſtandings, which no ray of genius, or taſte ever condeſcended to viſit.

Hence it is, that theſe gentlemen have been ſo often flattered with the notion of having made a wonderful diſcovery, if they ſtumble on a ſingle word, or a ſingle phraſe, which through the twilight of a confuſed memory, they think they have ſeen in other authors. One of Shakſpeare's commentators (I forget whether it was Mr. Malone) when the great bard puts into the mouth of one of his characters "Go before I'll follow, finds it out to be an alluſion to a paſſage in Terence" I præ te ſequar. And Dean Swift ſomewhere adverts to one of theſe ſagacious critics, who in order to prove that he was indebted for his Tale of the Tub, to a French book entitled Combat des Livres, cites the phraſes "*If I miſremember not,*" and "*I am*

"*aſſured,*"

assured," which he says, he found in the French author. These tasteless commentators are the very plague and bane of literature; and are a sort of poisonous weeds that grow up in the sweetest flowers of Parnassus; as Lucretius expresses it on another occasion,

Est etiam in magnis Heleconis montibus arbor
Floris odore hominem tetro consueta necare.

But to return to the phrase before us. Is there any reason to suppose, that Milton found the archetype of his own expression in Ovid; or that Shakspeare in this, (or his forger), should have copied from Milton? Is not the repetition of the word "thrice," a common figure in rhetoric? Did Dryden copy from either of these poets, when he exclaims in his ode to St. Cecilia,

"And thrice he routed all his foes,
"And thrice he slew the slain."

This is surely a species of criticism, which is founded on principles, so vague, and indefinite, that no rational man would ever propose it, as a test, to which a controversy of the present nature should be brought. It is, however, curious to attend to the personal sarcasms of the critic, when he says that he "*perfectly acquits the author of*

"*having*

" *having read Ovid.*" Had Mr. Malone been able to read Homer, he would have found this mode of expreſſion was his originally, but of this " *I entirely acquit him.*"

Whether Mr. Malone is intimately acquainted with the ſuppoſed forger of theſe papers or not, the ſarcaſm is lame and impotent, to whatever quarter it might have been directed. Whether the perſon, alluded to, has read Ovid or not, if any ſuch perſon exiſts, which Mr. Malone has not proved, it would be impoſſible to aſcertain. But for my own part, I ſhould prefer as a critic, and a ſcholar, the man, who never peruſed a ſingle line of Ovid, to him, who after all his reading, has neither ſenſibility to feel, nor capacity to underſtand that which he has read. I ſhould prefer the man, who neither diſfigures, nor defaces the literature, which lies within his reach, to him, whoſe knowledge is only acquired by rummaging the indexes, ſettling the punctuations, or exploring the dates of the writings that ſurround him.

Mr. Malone then finds another paſſage in this obnoxious letter, viz. when the poet tells his patron that " gratitude is a budde which blloſſomes, " bllooms, butte never dyes; itte cheriſhes " ſweete nature, ande lulls the calme breaſte toe " ſofte, ſofte repoſe." Not to employ ourſelves any further with the orthography, on which ſo much

much has been ſaid already, the good ſenſe of the paſſage is, I think but ſlightly affected by the critic's objection. He inſinuates that Shakſpeare was too good a naturaliſt not to know, that a bud firſt blooms, and then bloſſoms. And ſo it may be in Ireland, but in England, we are accuſtomed to ſay, that a tree firſt bloſſoms, but continues in bloom. Admitting the critic to be right, it is juſtified by the figures, Hyſteron and Proteron.

" There I was bred and born."

Then we have a piece of elaborate hyper-criticiſm, to prove that Dr. Warburton uſed the words " lulls our overwearied nature to repoſe," in one of his notes on Shakſpeare, and that this paſſage in the letter was plagiarized from it. Here, however, I ſhall leave Mr. Malone to his own triumph, and ſhall only obſerve, that it is a coincidence which might eaſily be accounted for, by thoſe, who have the ſlighteſt obſervation, or good ſenſe. The ſame emotions will generally ſpeaking, dictate nearly the ſame language. Shakſpeare in deſcribing the ſoothing effect of gratitude in the breaſt that cheriſhes it, could not find a combination of words more ſuited to him, than thoſe at which our commentator is diſpoſed to cavil: and Dr. War-

burton, when he ſought to convey an idea of that, which frees and diſengages the mind from care, would as naturally expreſs himſelf in the ſame diction. If Mr. Malone's be ſound criticiſm, the greater part of human compoſition is a plagiariſm it being impoſſible to avoid caſual coincidencies or even ſtriking reſemblances, where there exiſts an uniformity of circumſtances, and an identity of feeling in the different writers.

Mr. Malone next obſerves, that the concluſion of the letter is completely modern; "Oh, excuſe "me, mye lorde, more at preſente I cannotte."

"Yours devotedlye and with due reſpecte"

He objects to "*at preſente*" and to "*with due* "*reſpecte*," which he ſays are equally modern, as well as objectionable. Mr. Malone on this topic, obſerves, that there is a faſhion, in the ſtyle, and concluſion of letters. I agree with him, to the full extent of his obſervation. But does it follow, that this faſhion preſcribes preciſely the ſame terms and the ſame phraſes? Certainly not. The forms which at this time, prevail in letter-writing, either in the addreſs, or the concluſion, vary widely from each other. One man, ſays, "your humble ſer-"vant: another your devoted and obliged humble "ſervant," through an infinite variety of modifications. Now is it not very unfair reaſoning, in referring to the forms of the times, on which we are now occupied,

occupied, to ſet down any deviation from a ſpecific form, which might have prevailed at that period, as a forged, and unauthentic document? But, ſays Mr. Malone, the letter will not paſs for the compoſition of our poet, till an example be produced of a perſon in ſo low a ſituation, as that of a *player*, preſuming to conclude a letter to a nobleman with the modern familiar aſſurance of attachment, "Yours moſt "devotedly." In reply to this, let me aſk, whether Shakſpeare, at the time, he is ſuppoſed to have written this letter, ſtood in the mere rank and eſtimation of a "*poor player*?" Does not the critic know, that he was a poet, as well as actor; and that in every age, and period, the man of genuis, has been exalted almoſt to an equality with the patrons, that have encouraged and aſſiſted him? I contend therefore, that without any impropriety, and conſiſtently with the relations that ſubſiſted between him, and Southampton, Shakſpeare might make uſe of the form, in which he ſubſcribed his letter to that nobleman.

Now for the anſwer of the Earl to this epiſtle. The firſt verbal objection to the letter is urged againſt the ſtyle of addreſs "Deare William." Here as uſual, Mr. Malone dictates what was the preciſe mode of beginning a letter, at the time of which we are ſpeaking. With regard to its being imcompatible with the immeaſurable diſtance, at

which Shakſpeare ſtood from Lord Southampton, I affirm again, that there is nothing in the familiarity of addreſs at all irreconcileable to the ſpecies of connection, between our bard and his noble patron. The great have in all times lived in habits of familiarity with enlightened and ingenious men, and this is not the only inſtance, in which this familiarity is obſervable. But why ſhould I repeat an obſervation, which I have been compelled ſo frequently to make, concerning the temerity of laying down any preciſe or determinate form of expreſſion, as the only mode, which prevailed at a ſpecific period of time. Is it poſſible for Mr. Malone, or any other antiquary, to have examined a thouſandth part of the letters, written at that time? Why therefore, ſhould he draw ſuch particular and minute concluſions, from ſuch general and indefinite premiſes. Mr. Malone, knows as well as any body, that though there are general characteriſtical forms of expreſſion, that belong to every age, that there will always be minute exceptions and deviations from habits, however ſettled, and eſtabliſhed. Beſides, we are loſt in a world of uncertainty on this ſubject, when we attempt to frame a poſitive, and dogmatical opinion upon it. And perhaps, ſo little do we know concerning it, that the very ſpecimens, which Mr. Malone adduces to decide on the prevailing practice of the time

may

may only be in fact, deviations, and exceptions from the general rule, of which the records and monuments, may have been deſtroyed by time, and accident.

In page 107, I remarked upon the familiar terms of addreſs uſed at the period we are now ſpeaking of, and amongſt the reſt, I inſtanced "Deareſte friende" 1589; "Deareſte Py;" and again "My Deere Adiew." In the concluding ſentence of the letter, the objector has the threadbare animadverſion of its being too familiar, conſidered as the language of a nobleman to a player. Need I again recall the reader of this work, to the peculiar ſpecies of relation which ſubſiſted between theſe eminent men. Why does Mr. Malone, by applying to Shakſpeare the mere character, and deſignation of the player, overlook altogether his greater diſtinction of a poet; and not of a poet only, but of one, whom every age does not ſee, and to whom the world is naturally, and irreſiſtibly diſpoſed to pay a ſort of homage, that is allied to idolatry. If, however, after what has been ſaid upon this ſubject, it is at all neceſſary, to quote authorities in ſupport of the epiſtolary uſages, which we have been diſcuſſing, I will refer to Burleigh's State Papers, where it appears that the mode of ending letters, was capricious, and variable. "Your aſſured loving friend" in a

letter

letter to Sir William Cecil; "Yours always aſ-
"ſured, Secretary Petre to Secretary Cecil."
Your own aſſuredly, from the ſame perſon, and an infinite number of modifications, all which differ conſiderably from each other.

Next follows a minute examination, reſpecting the ſignature *Southampton*. I will quote the critic's own words. "In the reign of Elizabeth," ſays he, "as your lordſhip knows, noblemen in their ſig-
"natures, uſually prefixed their chriſtian name to
"their titles; as their ladies, and my lords, the
"biſhops, do at this day." But it is worth while attending to the reſervations in which Mr. Malone whenever he finds his general poſition untenable, endeavours to ſhelter himſelf. He ſays this was the ordinary practice, though a few peers deviated from that mode, aud ſubſcribed their titles only. So completely miſtaken, however, in his general propoſition is the ſagacious commentator, that he will find a double proportion of inſtances againſt him, if he had taken the trouble of making reſearches into the ſubject. I refer to the Shrewſbury MSS in the College of Arms, where there will be found with innumerable others, the following inſtances againſt the remark of Mr. Malone.

Nottingham

Nottingham	Suffolk
Howard	Devonſhire
Stafford	Northumberland
Lumley	Liſle
Pembroke	Saliſbury
Cranbourne	Fenelon.

If it is neſſary to refer to an earlier period, ſee Burleigh's State Papers, p. 442, &c. &c. where it will be obſerved, that there are ſeven examples of the Duke of Norfolk's letters having the ſignature of Norfolk. In the ſame work, p. 507, and 520, Lord Boyd, ſigns only Boyd. In page 537 and 552, there is the ſimple ſignature of "Lumley." In 568 Pembroke, and 569 Arundell. I ſhall bring forward no other documents on a ſubject, which a very few authorities will illuſtrate, it would be only an unprofitable but laborious idleneſs to expatiate. As to the aſſertion that Lord Southampton uniformly ſigned H. Southampton, it is obſervable, that it is ſupported by no other proof than the two ſpecimens from the Harleian Collection, and no argument therefore can be adduced to prove that he never wrote his name in any other mode. *De apparentibus & non existentibus eadem est ratio.* I obſerve alſo, that in the eyes of the moſt eminent antiquaries, theſe papers bear little or no reſemblance to the hand-writing of the age.

Let

Let me urge the reader to examine how far my aſſertion is grounded on fact, by an inſpection of the ſpecimens, publiſhed by Mr. Malone. The reader who caſts his eye over the two ſpecimens of this nobleman's hand-writing in the plate, which this gentleman has publiſhed, will obſerve as wide a diſſimilarity in the ſize and form of the letters, and in the ſignature eſpecially, as would be obſerved, in the hand-writing of two diſtinct individuals. Now where there are two autographs only, and in each of theſe the ſignatures differ, how can any man endued with common ſenſe, poſſitively affirm either of them ſpecifically to be the ordinary mode, in which the nobleman alluded to, wrote his name? To ſum up his objections to the letter, the critic is pleaſed to call the whole "falſe "and hollow" a miſerable, bungling, nonſenſical forgery. Has Mr. Malone, entered into any reaſonings upon the internal merits of theſe letters? If he has not, (as the reader has had ample opportunity of remarking) diſcuſſed them, and duly conſidered their ſtyle and beauty, but has picked out the little exceptions againſt them, on the ſcore of orthography, and epiſtolary uſage, this choice and elegant combination of epithets is contemptible, and ridiculous.

The profeſſion of faith next preſents itſelf, as a ſubject for Mr. Malone's animadverſion. Paſſing over

over the date, and orthography, the firſt topic, on which our critic enlarges, is grounded on the aſſumption of its being derived, in the ſame manner as ſome other of the documents, from ſome ſuppoſed model or archetype. It was formed, ſays he, "on a confeſſion of faith written by one John "Shakſpeare, which I (Mr. Malone) publiſhed "in the end of the year 1790." This paper however from ſubſequent circumſtances turns out not to be genuine; ſo that for the ſecond time the gentleman himſelf acknowledges that his own blunders and confuſion reſpecting a document, he imagined to be authentic, have proved the ſource of future forgeries of a ſimilar kind. From the confeſſions, however, which the critic is accuſtomed to make, from time to time, upon this ſubject, it ſhould ſeem, that he has much to anſwer for, at the public tribunal, for the confident publication of impoſtures, which at one time, he is pleaſed to obtrude on the world, and at another ſhameleſsly to retract, and diſavow.

But I ſhall take the liberty of exhibiting to the world, what the ſagacious gentleman, ſtyles a myſtical rhapſody.

PROFESSION OF FAITH.

I beynge nowe offe ſounde Mynde doe hope thatte thys mye wyſhe wille atte my deathe bee acceeded too as I nowe lyve in Londonne ande as mye ſoule maye perchance ſoone quitte thys poore Bodye it is mye deſire thatte inne ſuch caſe I maye bee carryed to mye Native place ande thatte mye Bodye bee there quietlye interred wythe as little pompe as canne bee ande I doe nowe inne theeſe mye ſeyrioufe Moments make thys mye profeſſione of fayth and whiche I doe moſt ſolemnlye believe I doe fyrſte looke toe ounc lovynge and greate God ande toe hys glorioufe ſonne Jeſus I doe alſo beleyve thatte thys mye weake and frayle Bodye wille retturne toe duſte but forre mye ſoul lette God judge thatte as toe hymſelfe ſhalle ſeeme meete O omnipotente ande greate God I am fulle offe Synne I doe notte thynke myſelfe worthye offe thye grace ande Yette wille I hope forre evene the poore pryſonerre whenne bounde with gallyng Irons evenne hee wille hope for Pittye and whenne the teares offe ſweet repentance bathe hys wretched pillowe he then looks and hopes forre pardonne

thenne

thenne rouze mye Soule and lette hope thatte ſweete cheriſher offe alle afforde thee comforte alſoe O Manne whatte arte thou whye conſidereſte thou thyſelfe thus grately where are thy great thye boaſted attrybutes buryed loſte forre everre inne colde Deathe O Manne why attempteſt thou toe ſearche the greatneſſe offe the Almightye thou doſte butte looſe thye labourre more thou attempteſte more arte thou loſte tille thye poore weake thoughtes arre elevated toe theyre ſummite ande thence as ſnowe fromme the leffee Tree droppe ande diſſtylle themſelves tille theye are noe more O God Manne as I am frayle bye Nature fulle offe Synne yette greate God receyve me toe thye boſomme where alle is ſweete contente ande happyneſſe alle is blyſſe where diſcontent iſſe neverre hearde butte where oune Bonde offe freyndſhippe unytes alle Menne Forgive O Lorde alle oure Synnes ande withe thye grete Goodneſſe take uſſe alle to thye Breaſte O cheriſhe uſſe like the ſweete Chickenne thatte under the Coverte offe herre ſpreadynge wings Receyves herre lyttle Broode and hoeverynge oerre themme keepes themme harmleſſe ande in ſaferye.

Wm. SHAKSPEARE.

With reſpect to the incidental obſervation of the orthography, and phraſeology, to which he brings the ſame thread-bare and ſenſeleſs exceptions, I refer to what I have ſo amply obſerved in a former part of this work. But the internal characteriſtics of it, the ſimple effuſions of a ſincere piety which it breathes, and the ſolemn and dignified diction it every where diſplays, are not, I truſt, affected by the taſteleſs abuſe of ſuch a critic as Mr. Malone. There are however ſome minute particularities of phraſeology, on which as he has beſtowed a conſiderable portion of obſervation, it behoves me by no means to diſregard.

The firſt paſſage ſelected for remark, is the alluſion to the *Chicken*, that ſpreads her wings for the protection of her brood. That it ſhould have been ſuggeſted by the paſſage in the New Teſtament, will not operate as a deduction from its beauty as a compoſition, or from the proof in favor of its authenticity. As to the inapplicability of the word "*chicken*," on which ſome ſtreſs is laid, I ſhall not detain my readers with minute, and frivolous remarks on the diſtinction between a hen, and a chicken. Without, however, taking up the ſubject as a matter of Natural Hiſtory, it muſt be obvious to all, that the word Chicken is a general term for the male and female ſpecies of this fowl; and in this ſenſe, none but the moſt deter-

determined, and incorrigible caviller can find any fault with the correctneſs of the expreſſion. Before however I quit this part of our ſubject, I would proteſt againſt a propoſition, laid down by Mr. Malone, with his characteriſtic confidence, that theſe apparent departures from veriſimilitude, on which he has alluded are obvious artifices, to give an air of authenticity to the whole, on the principle that a forger would have carefully avoided them. Now, I would aſk, whether this mode of procedure has been followed by forgers in general? Have they not, in all the inſtances, we have at preſent on record, diligently endeavoured, to throw the veil of truth, and probability over their productions. Mr. Malone might with equal reaſon, contend that he who forged a bank-note, and avoided all reſemblance or analogy to his archetype would be as ingenious and ſucceſsful as if he had imitated the aſpect and characteriſtics of that, which he wiſhed to repreſent.

We now come to another verbal topic, I mean, the exception to the uſe of the word *accede*, as not being the phraſe of the age, in which Shakſpeare flouriſhed. Here is an opportunity of triumph to the critic. A word, which bears not a general and acknowledged acceptation in the time, to which it is aſcribed, he immediately ſeizes as his natural prey. At what period, the word *accede*

rede in its preſent interpretation, firſt glided into uſe, it is impoſſible to aſcertain, nor has the objector himſelf attempted to prove. I will not turn to the lexicons, and gloſſaries of the age. Theſe are not authorities, for the uſe of words, which are always implicitly to be followed. Moſt unqueſtionably in thoſe days, as in the preſent, terms were uſed, which the compilers of dictionaries either overlooked or refuſed to recognize. How many words at this time may be found in the correcteſt writers, which it would be in vain to hunt for in any dictionary, or gloſſary exiſting, words however, which though they are deſtitute of authority or precedent, are ſtill juſtified by the analogy, and principles of the language. Beſides who has coined new words with greater licence than Shakſpeare? But I will not reſt on the probability, that the verb accede was in uſe at this time; becauſe the ſecondary and derivative word (acceſs) had obtained the ſame conſtruction. I will do more, I will ſhew from the authority of Florio's, dictionary publiſhed in 1611, that the word "accedere;" to *accede*, to *aſſent unto*, was known, and conſtantly in uſe at that time. Another proof of the ignorance of the commentator, as to the uſe of words in the time of Shakſpeare. I cannot take my leave of this topic, without beſeeching the reader, to compare the

Profeſſion

Profeſſion of Faith, which I have publiſhed, with that edited by Mr. Malone in the year 1790. The ridiculous cant, and jargon with which this deteſted impoſture overflows, forms the moſt ſtriking contraſt to the ſublime and pious ſimplicity, which conſtitutes the prominent merit of the former compoſition. In his critical animadverſions on the beauty of its ſtyle, I am willing to be at iſſue with ſuch a writer as this gentleman; when I may ſhelter myſelf under the reſpectable authority (with many others) of the venerable Dr. Jo. Warton, who on peruſing it, obſerved with much energy, "*that "though there were many beauties in the liturgy of our "church, yet this compoſition far ſurpaſſed them all!*"

The next piece, on which Mr. Malone employs his critical powers, is the letter from Shakſpeare to Richard Cowley, *a low actor*, as he is called, that played the part of Verges in *Much Ado About Nothing*? That a perſon, who performed the character was neceſſarily a low actor, is a very unfair inſinuation. Would any man be bold enough to call Mr. Garrick a *low actor*, becauſe he played Scrub, or Abel Drugger? And where is the hiſtory of Cowley to be found to juſtify Mr. Malone in his aſſertion that Cowley was a *low actor*, except from the ſuppoſition of his playing in Much Ado About Nothing? His theatrical powers might indeed be limited, but it is very probable

probable, that he might have held in private life, that fair and honorable eſtimation, that might have entitled him to the honour of our poet's friendſhip. What the critic, however objects to more particularly in this paper, are the two words "*wittye* "*and whimſicalle*" in the following paſſage. Ha- "vinge alwaye accountedde thee a pleaſaunte and "*wittye* perſonne and oune whoſe companye I doe "much eſteeme, I have ſent thee incloſedde a "*whimſicalle* conceyte." To the word "*wittye*" it is objected, that in our author's time, it was uſed excluſively in the ſenſe of cunning, ſhrewdneſs, and applied to the intellectual powers in general. In anſwer to this, I refer the commentator of Shakſpeare, to Shakſpeare himſelf.

Val. "Sir Thurio borrows his wit from your
"ladyſhip's looks, and ſpends what he
"borrows kindly in your company.

Two Gent. of Verona.
Act. 2, S. 4.

"That I had my good wit out of the
"Hundred merry tales."

Much Ado About Nothing.
Act. 2, S. 1.

In

In the fifth act of the ſame play Claudio ſays to Benedict, " we are high proof melancholy, and " would fain have it beaten away. Wilt thou uſe " thy *wit?*

What does this mean, but a requeſt, that Benedict would exert his powers of humour to diſpel the melancholy, of which he complained?

Again, in As You Like It, Act 5. Sc. 1.

William. " Ay, Sir, I have a pretty *wit.*"

And in Second Part of Henry V. Sc. 4, Falſtaff ſays

" I am not only *witty* in myſelf, but the cauſe that " *wit* is in other men."

Theſe quotations are ſufficient to ſhew, that the word was uſed at that time, in the peculiar ſenſe, which Mr. Malone's objection denies it, as well as in the more general and enlarged interpretation.

Upon the word " *whymſicalle*" we have references to the dictionaries of Cotgrave, Cole, and the other lexicographers of the critic. I ſhall ſpeak very little on this head. Dictionaries never admit words, which have not been in received and eſtabliſhed uſe. Now, I do not contend that the objected word had arrived at this general acceptation, before the time of Shakſpeare, or had obtained ſuch a general currency, as to introduce it into the compilations of Mr. Malone's literary

favorites, Cole and Cotgrave. But every word muſt have had its birth, and firſt introduction into the language. Dr. Johnſon traced this word no higher than Addiſon. Addiſon would probably, have referred him to ſome ſource, whence he derived it, and that ſource would probably have led to another. So that if it is impoſſible to point out the preciſe period, of its primary introduction, the preſumptive argument is as much in my favor, as in that of Mr. Malone; as it is equally as fair to aſcribe the firſt uſe of it to Shakſpeare, as to any other writer.

But it was an innovation by no means inconſiſtent with the principles of our language. All derivative languages like the Engliſh, are in a ſtate of perpetual progreſſion. Hence new words, at the mere diſcretion of a popular writer have been derived from the latin. Subſtantives and verbs require their ſeveral adjectives; and every one, in the unſettled periods of our diction, thought himſelf endued with a licence to derive adjectives from nouns, in general uſe, controlled by no other rule, than the common analogies of the tongue. The word *whim*, a contraction probably of *whim-wham*, was uſed at that time in the ſenſe applied to *whimſical*. It has been before obſerved, that Shakſpeare availed himſelf of the privilege of coining new words; and when ſo convenient a

phraſe,

phraſe, as the adjective of *whim*, held out a temptation, it is natural to ſuppoſe, that he did not reſiſt it. We have indeed an inſtance in which Shakſpeare has uſed the word *whimpled*, when ſpeaking of Cupid.

" *This whimpled, whining, purblind, wayward boy.*"

Dr. Johnſon ſuppoſes it to come from *whimper*, which has the ſame meaning, as *whine*. Now beſides the abſurdity of charging this beautiful paſſage with ſo groſs a tautology, it is contrary to the principles of our language, to ſuppoſe that *whimper* in its participle will be *whimpled*. It is not natural to ſuppoſe that it is compounded of " *whim-led*," which ſignifies " humorous, fantaſ-" tical" &c ? So that, if this conjecture be probable, there can remain ſcarcely a doubt concerning the general acceptation of the word, and it is no violent conjecture to ſuppoſe, that Shakſpeare might have given a common word the uſual termination of an adjective. I have now treſpaſſed conſiderably on the patience of the reader, in following Mr. Malone through the greater part of the intricate labyrinth of verbal objections, in which he has involved the ſubject. But much remains to be ſaid upon the other documents, againſt which our critic is pleaſed to take exceptions. What next preſents itſelf to our conſideration, is the

DEED of GIFT
To William Henry Ireland.

Mr. Malone obſerves ſarcaſtically, that this is the firſt deed he ever peruſed, where a ſtory was ſo regularly and circumſtantially told. Now it is worthy of remark, that the critic has preſented the deed in ſo defective and mutilated a form, that it is impoſſible to pronounce with preciſion concerning it, from his ſtatement of it. The beginning of the deed runs thus. "I William "Shakſpeare of Statford on Avon but now livyng "in London neare unntoe a yard calledd or knowne "bye the name of Irelands yarde in the Black-"fryars London nowe beyinge att thys preaſaunte "tyme of ſound mynde" &c. &c. "I didde "with my own hande fyrſte wryte on Papere the "contents hereof butte for the moure ſecurytye "ande thatte noe diſpute whatever myghte hap-"penne after my death," &c. Here then is an anſwer to every objection, that may be grounded on the informality of the deed, namely, the confeſſion made by Shakſpeare himſelf of his having written it in the manner, which his own mind ſuggeſted to him.

But the firſt objection is an anachroniſm, which it ſeems, Mr. Malone has found in the Inſtrument.

Shakſpeare

Shakſpeare in this deed, it is ſaid, deſcribes himſelf as living at Blackfryars in October, 1604. But it is manifeſt, ſays Mr. Malone, that the King's ſervants were not then poſſeſſed of the Blackfryars. What does this prove, allowing the objection in point of fact to be valid? Why it does not falſify a ſyllable of what appears on the face of the deed. If the Theatre was not at Blackfryars, might not the poet have reſided in that part of the metropolis? Nothing that contradicts ſuch a ſuppoſition, can be found in the hiſtory of his life.

Let us attend to the remark upon the circumcumſtance recorded in the deed, of the accident on the Thames. Whether Shakſpeare could ſwim, ſays the ſagacious gentleman, I have no means of aſcertaining. Now it is rather ſurprizing, that he who could take the gage, and dimenſions of Elizabeth's hand-writing, and could aſcertain with ſuch accuracy the progreſſive ſizes, to which it expanded as ſhe advanced in life, ſhould not be able to inform the world, whether Shakſpeare was an adept in ſwimming, and point out the place, where he ſwam, and the diſtance to which his art would enable him to ſwim. I think it however extremely probable, ſays the critic from the admirable lines in the Tempeſt, that he was well acquainted with that uſeful art. Can any remark be more truly abſurd?

abſurd? Does it neceſſarily follow, that Shakſpeare was verſed in the myſteries of every art, occupation, or myſtery to which he has alluded in his writings? It is a fact that the poet Thomſon was perfectly unacquainted with the ſcience of ſwimming, which he has deſcribed with ſuch glowing eloquence, and with ſuch minute accuracy. It is then inſinuated, as an incongruous and contradictory circumſtance, that none of his friends, nor the boatmen, but only W. H. Ireland ſhould have attempted his reſcue. Does Mr. Malone ſuppoſe that every boatman, who navigates a ſmall boat on the Thames is verſed in the art of ſwimming? I am afraid were Mr. M. himſelf to depend on ſuch aſſiſtance, were a ſimilar accident to befal him, that his ſpecific gravity would very ſoon reach the bottom of the river, eſpecially if he had a bundle of his notes on Shakſpeare in his pocket. But as to the affected banter of ſtripping off his jerkyn, &c. Let me aſk whether any one, who had the ſmalleſt degree of firmneſs, at ſuch a moment, or the ſlighteſt regard for the life of another, would make an attempt of this nature without throwing off the incumbrances of dreſs as quickly as he could, which at that time were very heavy, and would neceſſarily have obſtructed the the action of his limbs on ſuch an occaſion?

As to the word *upſet*, which Mr. Malone cenſures,

ſures, as a word of modern growth, the only grounds on which it is objected to are, that it is not to be found in Johnſon's Dictionary, and that he (Mr. M.) has not met with it. To theſe objections I anſwer that Dr. Johnſon, it is well known, has omitted ſeveral hundred words in general acceptation. Mr. Herbert Croft goes ſo far as to ſay thouſands. As to the objection, I ſhould be aſhamed ſeriouſly to refute the abſurd poſition that the critic lays down, *that no word can be genuine, with which he himſelf is unacquainted.*

Paſſing over the uſeleſs diſquiſition, which Mr. Malone has protruded into his work, concerning the William Henry Ireland mentioned in the deed, we are once more arrived at verbal diſcuſſions. In a conveyance to Shakſpeare (now in the poſſeſſion of Mr. Wallis) the tenement which he purchaſed, ſays the critic, is deſcribed, as having been "ſome-"times in the tenure of James Gardyner, Eſquire, "and ſince that in the tenure or occupation of one "William Ireland, or of his aſſignees or aſſigns." Now mark the ingenuous inference of the critic. "From the prefix *one*, the want of the addition "of *Gent.* and the word *occupation*, which at "that time was a word, that denoted trade, I had "no doubt that he was a tradeſman." A piece of more contemptible criticiſm, than the acceptation, which is applied to the word occupation by Mr.

Mr. Malone, never diſgraced the pages of any man, who pretended to criticiſm, or literature. The word *occupation* did at the period to which I am alluding, as well as at the preſent time, mean nothing more, than that the houſe was occupied by the perſon alluded to. As to the inſertion of the double name of *William Henry* Ireland, on which the preſumption of fraud is grounded by Mr. Malone, I would obſerve, that if, as Mr. Malone ſuppoſes, the forger had copied the authentic deed in which there was only a ſingle chriſtian name, he muſt have been extremely inexpert, and blindly ſtupid in the fabrication, had he not made his copy with a ſtricter accuracy.

Then we are informed, that in the laſt century and long after it, perſons of the firſt rank in England contented themſelves with one chriſtian name. It ſeems that our laborious inveſtigator has looked into liſts of the Houſe of Commons, into the catalogue of Baronets created by King James, among the Knights of the Bath, nay that he has pried into ſeveral parliaments, and that no ſuch diſtinction as a two-fold chriſtian name is to be found. What is to be ſaid to all this? my only reply, ſhall be the citation of authorities.

" Richard Maria Dumville, Eſq. born anno 1603."
" Huntingdon Haſtings Corney, Eſq. anno 1603."

" Anna

Anna Maria Eſtouſteville, ditto."

" Thomas Maria Wingfield, ap. temp. Edward 6th."

The above names were communicated to me by favor of Francis Townſend, Eſq. Windſor Herald.

In a " true report of a late Practiſe, &c." by Barnabie Riche, 1582, in quarto, black letter, the name of Captain Thomas Maria Wingfield will be found, and is moſt probably the perſon, before mentioned. In the Sheldon Pedigree will be obſerved Henrietta Maria, daughter of Thomas Savage, Viſ. Rock Savage, born 1618. In the will of Sir John White, of Tucksford, in the reign of James the 1ſt, the following name appears as a Witneſs. " Welbecke Marke Browneley." In *Lyſon*'s Environs of London, vol. 3, p. 71, it is obſerved, that the following baptiſmal entry is in the Hornſey Regiſter. " Lucius F. Thomæ " Gulielmi ex Louiſâ Mariâ, bap. 4. May 1637." Now if Louiſa Maria had a ſon in May 1637, it is moſt probable that ſhe was chriſtened about the period of the Dramatic Poet. I am alſo furniſhed by Mr. Beltz of the Heralds College, with the chriſtian name of Mark Antony, tho' the ſirname cannot be found. If there is need of further reference, I will cite the name of Henry Frederic,

ſon of James the Firſt. Nay I will refer to a ſtill earlier date. In *Lyſon*'s Environs, vol. 3, p. 11, we ſhall find as far back as the year 1416, an inſcription in Hendon Church, to the memory of "John Atte Hevyn."

Surely theſe citations will be ſufficient for my purpoſe. In fact, the uſe of the two-fold chriſtian names, ſo poſitively and dogmatically objected to by Mr. Malone, muſt have been a matter of ſuch undeniable notoriety, that I know not which is the moſt aſtoniſhing, the unaccountable ſtupidity of the perſon who overlooked theſe evidences, or his unparalled effrontery in making ſuch an aſſertion.

When Mr. Malone obſerves in this exceptionable deed of gift, that the written Plays of Henry IV. Henry V. King John, King Lear, &c. are named in the conveyance, he triumphantly exclaims, with his uſual arrogance and inaccuracy, that the Lear was not written till after October 24, 1604. The extreme ignorance, diſplayed in this poſition, is almoſt intolerable. He perſiſts in ſaying that the Play was written after James was proclaimed king, *and that was not on the 24th of March* 1602-3, *but on the 24th of October* 1604. *So much for accuracy of dates!* In reply to this, I quote Camden's Elizabeth, Book 4, p. 661. which will clearly prove the ignorance of the critic on this ſubject.

"On

" On the 24th of March, 1602-3, being " the Eve of the Annunciation of the Bleſſed " Virgin, ſhe (Queen Elizabeth) was called out " of the priſon of her earthly body, &c. &c. " The ſad miſs which ſhe left of herſelf to the " Engliſh, was much leſſened by the great hope " conceived of the vertues of King James her " ſucceſſour, who A FEW HOURS AFTER *was pro-* " *claimed King*, with the joyfull ſhouts and ac- " clamations of all the people."

" The King" (James of Scotland) " being " arrived to the 36th year of his reign, continued " a good correſpondence with Queen Elizabeth, " as the only way to ſecure his ſucceſſion, ſhe " having a little before her death, (which hap- " pened on the 24th of March 1602) declared " him her ſucceſſor. Whereupon he was THE SAME " DAY at Whitehall *proclaimed King of England*, " Scotland, France and Ireland, with great Ac- " clamations."

Sandford's Hiſtory of England,
Book VII. Chap. I. p. 554.

As to the fatal objection of the indorſement of the words 2 James, which it ſhould ſeem is a deciſive proof of the forgery, let me remind the reader, that it is by no means improbable, that

the deeds were indorſed, a very long period after they were executed, and upon the beſt authority I learn that deeds of that period were ſeldom indorſed at the time they were drawn. I have ſhewn the deed to many antiquaries, and to perſons of the law, verſed in the learning of theſe Papers, who have confirmed this remark. Theſe are all the obſervations, which I ſhall make upon the deed, which Mr. Malone has ſelected as the peculiar victim to his exceptions. What I have ſaid, will I truſt, be found to comprize all that it behoves me to ſay upon the ſubject. I do not take the defence of the Inſtrument upon me any further, than by proving the allegations of Mr. Malone to be fallacious, and unfounded. And it is a rule in logic, that when the negative is diſproved, the contrary propoſition is eſtabliſhed.

Now for the *Tributary Lines to Ireland.*

" Oh model of Virtue Charity's ſweeteſt
" Child, thy Shakſpeare thanks thee
" Nor Verſe, nor Tear can
" paint my Soul nor ſay by
" half how much I love thee."

" I beg pardon," exclaims Mr. Malone, (who among other caprices, has affected a ſtyle of gallantry) " of all the young ladies of Great Britain

" and

" and Ireland; there is not one of them, fifteen " years old, who would not produce a better ef- " fuſion after reading the firſt novel, that fell into " their hands." I ſolemnly wiſh, that this gentleman, may never have ſtronger reaſons to beg pardon, and deprecate the anger of the ſex, than the ſuppoſition, for which he apologizes.

But the next objectionable article, is the view of Wm. Henry Ireland's houſe, and coat of arms, &c. It is objectionable on account merely on the word *View*, being wholly unknown, as he ſays at the time, in the ſenſe of a delineature of a houſe, &c. on canvas, paper, or copper. Then as uſual, he tells us where he has ſearched; and the authorities of lexicographers, and vocabularies, into which he has examined: though all this does nothing at all, but exhibit an illuſtration of the inſtinct, with which this gentleman is endowed, of never looking into the proper places.

In Florio's Italian Dictionary printed 1611, *veduta* or *viſta* has the Engliſh ſenſe annexed " any " ſight, view, or proſpect," with other ſynonemes of the ſame tendency. It is acknowledged by Mr. Malone, that in this ſenſe the word was uſed in French ſo early as the ſixteenth century; and it is not therefore, an aſſumption to ſuppoſe that it ſhould have crept into our idiom, much earlier, than the period, to which Mr. Malone attributes it. I ſay nothing

nothing about the alluſion to the ſource from which this Haberdaſher, as he is contemptuouſly termed, derived his armorial bearings. We all know, that ſome of the moſt antient families in this country ſprung originally from the commercial departments of life; and perhaps were we to examine the original fountain, whence Mr. Malone derived the arms of his own family we ſhould not find them more honorably or unequivocally obtained.

We will now ſay a few words on the two coloured drawings, repreſenting the characters of Baſſanio, and Shylock: and here, for the firſt time, we are ſurprized with a modeſt confeſſion on the part of the objector, that he had never ſeen, what he objects to, and that if he had ſeen them, he was not entitled by any knowledge of the art to decide upon them. In oppoſition to his aſſertion, that he "has received information from un-"queſtionable judges, that they are drawings of "a recent date," I would obſerve, that waving my own pretenſions to an accurate knowledge of theſe matters, I appealed to the judgement of Artiſts, whom I looked upon as the moſt competent to pronounce on the ſubject. The uniform opinion of theſe perſons was, that they were the genuine productions of the times, to which they are imputed. In the courſe of ſeveral months, during which the drawings remained in my poſ-

ſeſſion,

ſeſſion, I diſcovered an illegible hand-writing, but I was never able to decypher it. On ſhewing it however to Mr. Hewlet of the Temple, whom I have mentioned in my preface, that gentleman with the aſſiſtance of glaſſes, diſcovered the name of Johannes Hoſkins, a perſon who at a later period we are told by the late Lord Orford and other writers, became an artiſt of great merit.

AGREEMENT

Between SHAKSPEARE and LOWINE.

On this head, it appears, that the papers of a Mr. Henſlowe, laid before the public in Mr. Malone's laſt edition 1793 of Shakſpeare, are appealed to, in oppoſition to the validity of the agreement now under conſideration. Now, upon the hypotheſis of the forgery of the papers, does it not appear very ſingular, even to the Critic himſelf, that the fabricator ſhould not have reſorted to theſe valuable treaſures of Mr. Henſlowe, eſpecially as the greater part of them had been circulated in a book, which might be found in every book-ſtall through the country?

However the principal objection is, that John Lowin tho' he ſays "his name was ſometimes written Lewin, never is to be found *Lowine*." Is it not ſtrange, that Mr. Malone, the commentator on Shakſpeare ſhould ſo heedleſsly convict himſelf of never

never having looked into the firſt folio Edition of the Great Bard, publiſhed 1623. Let me then inform him, that in the liſt of the actors, he would have found this man's name ſpelt in the objectionable manner. "John Lowine." This is ſurely a bad ſpecimen of Mr. Malone's accuracy. In his claſical way we may ſay, *ab uno crimine diſce* OMNES. When Mr. Malone again quotes a learned language, I would exhort him to be aware of the *diſtinctions of genders*, though it is a ſpecies of learning, in which I am informed, he is not minutely verſed. For *omnes* read *omnia*, as I have before remarked.

The word *Compoſition* is objected to, as to the acceptation that it bears in the agreement, I ſhall refer to no other authorities to juſtify the ſenſe, but that which Mr. Malone himſelf has cited in a note. "Simple is the device, and the *compoſition* "meane." Epiſt. Ded. to Mother Hulbard's Tale, 1590. No one who reads this paſſage, can queſtion the inapplicability of the quotation.

AGREEMENT

Between Shakspeare and Condell.

The firſt topic that occurs on this head in the ſhape of an objection, is the thread-bare obſervation on the denotation of a guinea "as oune pounde "and

" and oune ſhillynge per week." I ſhall not reiterate the reaſonings, on which I have entered in a former part of the work, but I ſhall gladly leave Mr. Malone to the enjoyment of the fulleſt triumph that his vanity can derive from ſo trivial and ſenſeleſs a cavil.

It ſeems very ſurprizing to Mr. Malone, that the ſalary which Lowine received at the theatre, ſhould have exceeded that of Condell, who ſtood ſo high in the eſtimation of Shakſpeare and whoſe name ſtands as a patentee immediately after that of Heminges. Whatever might be the rank which Condell held in the friendſhip of the bard, his merits as an actor might have been very inſignificant. It is reaſonable to preſume that the players were rewarded according to their profeſſional talents at that time, as at preſent. Shakſpeare himſelf we are taught to believe was by no means a good actor; and his name might ſtill ſtand firſt as a principal patentee in the Theatre.

Then we are reminded that from the terms of the agreement by which he covenants " for three " years to play upon the ſtage, for the ſaid Wm " Shakſpeare alle Comedyes ande Tragedyes " which he the ſaid Wm Shakſpeare may at any " *tyme during the ſaid terme cauſe to be played not* " *written or compoſed by himſelf butte are the wri-* " *tings or compoſytyons of others*; from which we muſt

ſuppoſe that he would never ſuffer one of his own "pieces to be performed in his own playhouſe, or "that he bore ſuch enmity to Condell, that he had "made a fixed reſolution that he this actor ſhould "not diſcharge any part in them." This is the concluſion into which our critic wiſhes to precipitate his readers. But is it an improbable ſuppoſition that the covenant was a ſeparate agreement, for the expreſs performance of the plays that were not written by himſelf, and that thoſe of his own compoſition therefore, had been the ſubjects of a diſtinct and ſpecific agreement. We are then favoured with another concluſion of the ingenious gentleman, conceived in the true ſtyle and genius of his profound criticiſms. This remark only amounts to this, that he infers the deed of Condell to be ſpurious, and that Condell could not have uſed the peculiar ſort of autograph in the MS becauſe he himſelf in the courſe of his favorite reſearches into Pariſh Veſtries and *Charnel Houſes*, has not ſtumbled upon that actor's autograph.

As to the indorſement of the deed (not to obſerve that the indorſement might have been probably made many years after the deed) to the Engliſh form of which Mr. Malone objects, I ſhall refer the reader to ſeveral authentic deeds now in the poſſeſſion of a gentleman, to whom I have the liberty of referring, ſhould any particular enquiry

enquiry be made on this head. Amongſt theſe is an *Engliſh Indorſement* in the following deed, viz. A Deed of Gift made in the 22d year of the reign of Henry VI. by John Cannyeforde to John Wolfele of landed property at Trowbridge Wilts. The Deed is in Latin, and Cannyeforde is there deſcribed *Clericus*; and the indorſement is as follows. "John "Kannyeforde *Clark*." There is alſo another deed of gift dated 28th Edward III. in Latin from Wm. Heye to Philippo le Schephurde, and it is indorſed in Engliſh thus "28th Edward third, Phl. le "Schephurd." Among innumerable other deeds with the citation of which I ſhall not overwhelm the faculties of the reader, I have ſelected theſe, which I truſt will ſhew very fully that there are exiſting indorſements in Engliſh to deeds of the period, on which we are now occupied.

The Leaſe to Michael Fraſer next comes under animadverſion. Upon this head I ſhall not detain the reader very long. But I might advert with juſtifiable ſeverity to the ſarcaſtic alluſion made by the critic to the perſons who ſubſcribed to the work. Their rank in life and the literary reputation of the greater part, whoſe names adorn the catalogue, are far above the reach of any ridicule that Mr. Malone can direct againſt them. But the critic's principal objection is this; *that the Globe on the Southwark ſide of the Thames*, is de-

 ſcribed

ſcribed to be by *Black Friars, London.* Upon this ſubject I ſhall ſay but little; not feeling it my duty to diſcourſe at large upon all the wire-ſpun and trivial cavils that a critic like Mr. Malone is able to bring forward. I produced the deed in the preſence of many intelligent perſons, who were of opinion that the word (*by*) ſhould be conſtrued with a greater latitude of meaning, than Mr. Malone ſeems to allow it; and that it ſignifies general vicinity, rather than a ſtrict proximity. And here I will make one general obſervation, which the candid reader will apply to other parts of the MS. I would remark that amongſt a multifarious maſs of papers, like thoſe in my poſſeſſion, it would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that ſome would not furniſh matter of petty quibble, and exception to thoſe minds, which are not ſufficiently comprehenſive to embrace general arguments, or purſue general reaſonings upon theſe ſubjects.

And now we are approaching that, which Mr. Malone ſtyles to be worſe than the "thickeſt "Cimmerian darkneſs," the deed of truſt to John Hemynges. They who are converſant with the critic's powers of illuſtrating and penetrating obſcurities, will be rather ſurprized that he ſhould have any objection to that, with which he is ſo very familiar. Every animal is endued with natural

tural organs adapted to the element in which it lives; and I have always thought, that black letter criticks and commentators who ſeem to breathe only in darkneſs, never enjoyed repoſe 'till they had brought their author's ſenſe and meaning to the miſt and obſcurity of their own underſtandings and apprehenſions.

But let us endeavour to ſtate conciſely one or two of Mr. Malone's objections. The firſt is, that the deed ſets out with informing us, that at the time at which the deed is dated, Shakſpeare had not yet returned into the country. The deed of mortgage in the next year (March 10th and 11th, 1612-13) is adduced by Mr. Malone to invalidate the poſition. On this head I have only to remark that the objection is not ſupported by the mortgage deed; becauſe the intervening year would have afforded Shakſpeare ample time for the retirement to which the critic refers.

Then it is animadverted on, as improbable, that the deed ſhould have opened in theſe words, "having found muche wickedneſs amongſt thoſe "of the lawe, &c." very unlikely ſays Mr. Malone, that he ſhould have had ſo low an opinion of lawyers, when he was in habits of friendſhip with ſeveral members of that profeſſion. What incongruity and what inconſiſtency is there in this? Why does Mr. Malone infer, that becauſe our bard

bard had a few connexions in that profeſſion, for whom he had the higheſt eſteem and reſpect, he could not have entertained a general impreſſion againſt the character of the body in general? The objector ought to have known alſo, that there are a variety of paſſages in the works of Shakſpeare, in which he has put into the mouths of his perſonages many very ſevere and ſtriking animadverſions on the body, againſt which Mr. Malone thinks it impoſſible, that he could have imbibed any diſlike or prepoſſeſſion.

Theſe are ſpecimens of his reaſonings upon the deed of truſt to Heminges, with which I ſuppoſe the reader will be perfectly ſatisfied. He has indeed favoured us with many other obſervations, drawn from the armoury of antiquarian and legal reſearches, with which I ſhall not condeſcend to interfere. My purpoſe was not that of purſuing Mr. Malone through all the dark avenues and ſubteraneous apartments of the gothick edifice of reaſoning, which he has erected with ſuch infinite labour and diligence.

Mr. Malone, p. 300, with reſpect to the child mentioned in the deed, to whoſe uſe the eight plays are appropriated, ſays that he "preſumes the "child to be Shakſpeare's god-ſon young William "D'Avenant; and "I fear," ſays he, "that I am "anſwerable for his having been brought for-

"ward."

" ward." So that the critic acknowledges himſelf guilty of what has not been laid to his charge, viz. of having brought a bantling into the world. I ſincerely hope that Mr. Malone will have the grace to eraſe the confeſſion of the illicit and wanton ways of which he pleads guilty, in his future editions of Shakſpeare.

But becauſe I have not entered into all the abſtruſe arguments, in which he has bewildered himſelf and his readers, it would be an unfair inference to draw, that I have not ſucceeded in the object of this work, which was that of expoſing the greater part of the fallacies, errors, ſophiſms, and impertinent cavils with which he has attempted to impoſe on the world, in the ſhape of critical inveſtigations. Let the topics I have ſelected, ſerve as a general ſpecimen of the ſtyle of his writing and the force of his arguments. Let the public judge by the articles I have examined, of the reſt of thoſe broken wares and mouldy commodities, he has expoſed to ſale.

I have now finiſhed my obſervations on that part of Mr. Malone's work, which reſpects the deeds and documents. I ſhall now only treſpaſs on the patience of the reader, with a few remarks on the *Lear* and the *Hamlet*.

Here the Critic ſets out with an ingenuous avowal of his being utterly diſqualified for the diſcuſſ[illegible]n

ſuſſion of the ſubject. He obſerves that he has not collated a ſingle line of the Lear, except one ſpeech; and that life would be too ſhort for the examination of ſuch traſh, when a ſingle glance is ſufficent to ſhew it to be a plain and palpable forgery. Yet it might be imagined, that he whoſe whole life has been ſpent in the taſk, to the drudgery of which he now takes ſuch an extraordinary averſion, would not have felt much repugnance to the minute and ſlender inquiries of collating, and exploring the paſſages on which he notwithſtanding preſumes to give a deciſive, and oracular opinion. "Three words" ſays he, "will ſuffice on the ſub-"ject." Yet theſe three words, multiplying themſelves like the polypi, are made to fill nearly twenty pages of his volume.

As to the ſingle paſſage he has ſelected, I ſhall ſay a few words.

Alb. "Whats the matterre Sir."

Leare. "Marke mee Ile tell the life and death I amme "aſhamed thou haſt powerre to ſhake mye manhood "thuſſe, that theſe hotte teares that breake fromme mee "perforce ſhould make worſe blaſts and foggs "onne the unnetennedere woundinges of a fatherres *curſe* "*Eyſſe* playe thys part agayne Ile plucke ye oute and caſte "you with the waterres that you maye temperre claye."

Allowing Mr. Malone the incorrectneſs of the ſpeech as it ſtood, I by no means admit it to be a fair

a fair ſtandard by which the reſt is to be eſtimated.

In the ſixth line, after the word *fathers*, *curſe* is unqueſtionably omitted, and in the next line *uſſe* is an error inſtead of *Eyſſe*, as it ſtands in the MS. Theſe are errors of tranſcription for which I am alone accountable, but if the reader with theſe corrections will peruſe the paſſage, I am perſuaded that it will appear in a light totally different, if not a real emendation of the vulgar text.

But let me beſeech the reader to attend to the following lines in the MS (the ſpeech of Kent in the laſt ſcene), which Mr. Malone obſerves that any ſchool boy might have written.

Kente. " Thanks Sir butte I goe toe thatte unknowne lande.
" Thatte chaynes each Pilgrim faſte within its ſoyle
" Bye livynge menne moſte ſhunn'd mouſte dreaddede
" Stille mye goode maſterre this ſame journey tooke
" He calls me I amme contente and ſtrayght obeye
" Thenne farewelle worlde the buſye ſceane is done
" Kente liv'd mouſte true Kente dyes mouſte lyke a " manne."

I make no comment upon theſe lines, though I cannot abſtain from remarking, that he who compares this emendation with the following ſpeech of Kent, as it exiſts in the other editions,

"I haue a journey, Sir, ſhortly to go;
"My maſter calls me, I muſt not ſay, no."

and does not pronounce it to be replete with pathos and energy, muſt reſign all pretenſions to critical diſcernment as well as poetical taſte. The above paſſage has received the commendations of all who have read it; and it is much more eaſy, after the ſpecimen he has given us of his taſte and erudition, to ſuppoſe that Mr. Malone is not endued with the ſlighteſt particle of either, than that the beſt ſcholars of the age ſhould have given their ſuffrage in favor of lines, which any ſchool boy might have written.

We are next told, as an objection to the papers, that the method of numbering the lines, is unauthorized by the uſage of Shakſpeare and the time in which he wrote. Here we have once more an unauthorized aſſertion. Is Mr. Malone to impoſe the tenet of the Pythagorean School on his diſciples? Is every poſition, which falls from his pen, to be received with implicit reverence, on matters of controverſy like the preſent? Has this gentleman in his poſſeſſion any of the original MSS of Shakſpeare, to ſhew the ſpecific uſage of the bard in this reſpect? If he has not, upon what ground does his inference reſt? The ſame obſervation will apply to the circumſtance of the

plays,

plays, having been written on one ſide only of the paper. It may be further remarked, that at that time, theſe uſages muſt have been variable, and uncertain, and I would obſerve that as far as the latter objection goes it is invalid, becauſe many of the MSS. in my poſſeſſion contain the writing on both ſides, which Mr. Malone poſitively aſſerts, the quality of the paper would not admit of.

At the cloſe of theſe remarks, we are preſented with an argument, which it would ſurely perplex our modern logicians, and thoſe who are verſed in the prevailing forms of reaſoning, to analyze, and examine. "The outworks being demoliſhed the "fort muſt ſurrender," in plain Engliſh, having laid down in a maſs of accumulated aſſertion, that the other writings, whether love letters, addreſſes to his patron, or copies of verſes, are a collection of unintelligible nonſenſe, the Play of Vortigern, which he had not read, nor ſeen, nor examined, muſt be unintelligible nonſenſe likewiſe. This is the new faſhioned ſyllogiſm, with which the garrulous commentator has finiſhed his obſervations on the ſubject of the amended plays, lately preſented to the world. I have adverted to it, that the reader may ſee the uniform tenor of the learned gentleman's reaſoning, and obſerve the admirable correſpondence and unity of ſtructure and deſign, that prevails through the whole

of his inquiry from the firſt to the laſt page of his book.

As to the whole length portrait of Shakſpeare in oil, and the uncut two firſt folios, ſarcaſtically alluded to by Mr. Malone, I have nothing to remark farther, than that the communication was made to me by my ſon, and that all the information I ever received concerning them, reſts on his authority. As a proof of Mr. Malone's accuracy with reſpect to the facts advanced in his book, he talks (in a note), of a letter in which Shakſpeare ſpeaks highly of *Vortigern* and inſiſts on a larger price for the copy-right of it than his bookſeller was willing to give him. On this I have to remark, that the letter alluded to, does not ſpecify *Vortigern*, nor does it bear any appearance of its alluding to that play at all. This will ſerve for as good a ſpecimen of the critic's faculty of dreaming, as that with which he has favoured us at the concluſion of his volume.

To ſhew the facility, with which an impoſture of this kind might be conducted, the critic cites an inſtance of his own patience and labor, in the execution of a taſk which he preſcribed to himſelf, of copying out the whole poem of Romeus and Juliet, in three days. This however proves only what the laborious texture of Mr. Malone's mind is capable of ſuſtaining. It is a capacity which I do not mean to deny him in common,

with

with every ſtationer's apprentice and clerk in the kingdom. With the ſame pains and diligence he might have copied the Iliad, without being able to interpret a ſingle character of the Greek language, or Euclid's works, without knowing a ſingle propoſition in mathematics. But does this inſtance of perſevering dulneſs apply to the maſs of papers before us; in which not only manual induſtry, but manual dexterity, and identity of fiction, and no ordinary powers of mind are uniformly diſplayed, upon the hypotheſis of its being an impoſture?

But this collection of remarks, egotiſms, and conjectures at length ſeems to approach its termination. Mr. Malone has diſplayed all the varieties of the human faculty in the courſe of his enquiry: he has been the critic, the wit, the antiquary, the ſcholar, the man of gallantry. But what ought to exhibit the ſingular dexterity of Mr. Malone in acting the ſeveral parts he has aſſumed, is the circumſtance that nature has denied him all the qualities requiſite for the taſk; juſt as it would be a ſurpriſing feat of dexterity, if a man were to dance the rope without legs; for he is at once a critic without taſte, a poet without imagination, a ſcholar without learning, a wit without humour, an antiquary without the leaſt knowledge of antiquity, and *a man of gallantry, without*——

But

But the art in which he poſſeſſes a truly admirable faculty, is that of *Dreaming*. Over dreams he poſſeſſes an unlimited dominion; and he ſeems like the God of Dreams in Virgil, ſurrounded with all the drowſy powers and agents, which thronged in the eternal abode of ſilence and ſleep.

After having tried the powers of his art in lulling his readers to ſleep, through the courſe of ſeveral hundred pages, he concludes with a long account of his own dream, which for the amuſement of my readers, I ſhall attempt to analyze and examine.

In a collection of marvellous ſtories, known by the name of Wanley's Wonders of the little World, as well as in Quevedo's celebrated viſions, we have many very remarkable ſtories of dreams. But the dream of Mr. Malone is ſo extraordinary, that it out-wonders all the wonders, that ever were recorded in any book whatever. Dreams are ſaid to be copies of our waking impreſſions. This dream is therefore the more wonderful, as it cannot poſſibly be preſumed to be a copy of any waking impreſſion, that ever viſited the underſtanding of Mr. Malone, for he dreams, Gentle Reader, that he is tranſported to Parnaſſus, and ſitting as counſel for Shakſpeare, among Apollo and his nine Siſters!!! and it is not to be ſuppoſed that this gentleman had ever any waking notions of making

making an excurſion to Parnaſſus, and he is too modeſt and deficient to obtrude himſelf into the ſociety of nine ladies, with whom he has ſo ſlight an acquaintance.

Then after a beautiful and fanciful deſcription of the immortal bards in Elyſium, who it ſeems were employed in practiſing upon their fiddles, the dreamer at laſt finds out the great dramatic poet playing at bowls with Spencer, Suckling and Hales. What is more remarkable ſtill, he finds him out by his reſemblance to a picture in the poſſeſſion of the Duke of Chandos, "*three copies* "*of which are in my poſſeſſion.*" Here however, the dreamer has forgot what one of his fraternity has ſo fully proved with ſo much ingenuity and learning, namely, that it bears no reſemblance at all to the authentic engraving of Droeſhout, which has received the teſtimony of Ben Jonſon. But that our immortal bard, who was the plaintiff in the ſuit, on the trial of which Mr. Malone was engaged as counſel, ſhould be playing a game at bowls, is another aſtoniſhing proof of the extraordinary gift of dreaming, with which the critic is endued. Virgil deſcribes the departed ſpirits in Elyſium as occupied in the concerns and amuſements with which they were gratified when alive. But the peep of our critic into thoſe regions, will for the future correct the error of the antient mythology,

thology, from which Virgil derived his notion, unleſs Mr. Malone intends to gratify the world with a tract to prove from ſome of the documents *in his poſſeſſion*, that Shakſpeare, Suckling and Spencer were very fond of playing at the game of bowls or nine-pins.

But perhaps it is quite as remarkable that Shakſpeare ſhould have required the aſſiſtance of a counſel to appear in his behalf before Apollo and the Muſes; and that he ſhould have ſent for Mr. Malone from the other world to undertake his defence. If it was neceſſary the cauſe ſhould have been entruſted to a commentator, Apollo might have found out a crowd of critics, black letter compilers, and lexicographers, nay his old friends, Cotgrave, Minchen, Barret and Phillips. But one might have thought that amongſt the ſacred groupes, that thronged in thoſe celeſtial regions, there would be no dearth of advocates in the cauſe of ſo diſtinguiſhed a bard. Milton, Spenſer, Cowley and Pope, would ſurely have been called into court inſtead of Mr. Malone, to protect the violated rights and the ſacred reputation of a member of their own corporation, who one would have thought has ſuffered too much from the diſputes of critics and commentators, to rely much upon their efforts in his cauſe.

Here I cloſe my obſervations on the dream of

Mr.

Mr. Malone; and in the courſe of this pamphlet, I hope I ſhall have proved, that as a critic and a ſcholar, Mr. Malone is entitled to an equal degree of attention, whether he dreams or whether he is awake.

And here I would exhort the reader not to conſider me as an advocate for the authenticity of the controverted MSS. The taſk of refuting the reaſonings of Mr. Malone is diſtinct from that of eſtabliſhing either the affirmative or negative propoſition on this doubtful and myſterious queſtion. I wiſh to defend the cauſe of literature and of ſound criticiſm, which are effectually wounded if dogmatic aſſertions, inſinuations, and miſrepreſentations are allowed to triumph over ſolid and ſubſtantial inveſtigation. It would be a labour infinitely above my ability, though the very attempt would ennoble the meaneſt capacity, *melioribus humeris ſuſtinendum*, to deſtroy the ſpirit of vague and conjectural criticiſm, which has ravaged the fields of poetry, imagination and ſcience. How far I have ſucceeded, is a point on which I ſhall not preſume to determine; and I cloſe the ſubject with the ſatisfactory conſciouſneſs, that in appealing to the world, I have laid the merits of my cauſe, before that tribunal, which will not ſuffer the voice of truth to be overwhelmed and extinguiſhed.

F I N I S.

ADDENDA.

THE word *Maſter*, which Mr. Malone ſays was never thus ſpelt in the time of Elizabeth, will be found in the title to "*Forteſcue's new Book in Commendation of the Laws of England, printed in* 1599, "Written in Latin by the learned and right honorable *Maſter* Forteſcue, Knt."

Grafton's Chronicle, printed in 1569, has in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to Sir William Cecil, Knt. the Word, *Maſterſhip* and *Maiſterſhip*, thus differently ſpelt in the ſame page.

For inſtances of double Chriſtian names, I am favored with the following, ſince this work was printed.

Henry Roger Boyle, died in 1615: See Lyſon's London, Vol. 4, p. 365.

Eyton John Seymour: See Viſitation of Berkſhire.

William Robards Smith, anno 1604, Blomfield's Norfolk, Vol. 3, p. 584.

ERRATA.

Page 31, *line* 8, *for* 1354, *read* 1534.
32, — 18, *for* Cotrave, *read* Cotgrave. Bullekar, *read* Bullokar *and in* Sherrwood, *dele the ſecond* r.
35, *laſt line but two, for* in, *read* or to.
36, — 10, *for* Cronicle, *read* Chronicle.
43, — 21, *after* his work, *read* he ſays.
51, — 16, *for* ſimiliar, *read* ſimilar.
81, — 3, *for* rationai, *read* rational.
136, — 19, *for* Hubard *read* Hubbard.

ADDENDA.

THE word *Master*, which Mr. Malone says was never thus spelt in the time of Elizabeth, will be found in the title to "*Fortescue's new Book in Commendation of the Laws of England, printed in* 1599, "Written in Latin by the learned and right honorable *Master* Fortescue, Knt."

Grafton's Chronicle, [illegible] 1569, has in the Epistle Dedicatory to [illegible] Cecil, Knt. the Word, *Mastership* [illegible], thus differently spelt in the same page.

For instances of double Christian names, I am favored with the following, since this work was printed.

Henry Roger Boyle, died in 1615: See Lyson's London, Vol. 4, p. 365.

Eyton John Seymour: See Visitation of Berkshire.

William Edwards Smith, anno 1604, Blomfield's Norfolk, Vol. 3, p. 584.

ERRATA.

Page 31, *line* 8, *for* 1334, *read* 1334.
32, — 18, *for* Cottave, *read* Cotgrave. Sullehar, *read* Sullehar *and in* Sherwood, *del. the* [illegible] *read* 1.
35, *last line but two, for* in, *read* ex in.
39, — 10, *for* Cronicle, *read* Chronicle.
43, — 21, *after* his work, *read* he says.
51, — 16, *for* similiar, *read* similar.
81, — 3, *for* rationai, *read* rational.
96, — 19, *for* Hubard *read* Hubbard.